

REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED IN WHOLE OR IN PART

VOL. XIX
 PAGES 937-973

No. 23

WEEK ENDING JUNE 9, 1961

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Congressional Score	ii
Major Action	937
Sound The Bells	944
Status of Appropriations	946
Committee Windup	948
Political Notes	956
Pressures on Congress	957
Presidential Report	960
State of the Charts	968
House of the Charts	970
Week in Congress	iv

Floor Action

**Senate Housing Bill
 Tax Extension
 Departmental Appropriations**

Page 937-43

Kennedy-Khrushchev Meeting

Page 944

Youth Employment Request

Page 946

**CQ Poll
 On Summer Recess**

Page 947

**Florida
 Redistricting**

Page 954

COMMUNIST PARTY DECISIONS

Page 967

BY CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY INCORPORATED

The Authoritative Reference on Congress

1156 NINETEENTH STREET, N.W. • WASHINGTON 6, D. C. • FEderal 8-4660

COPYRIGHT 1961

Congressional Boxscore

MAJOR LEGISLATION IN 87th CONGRESS

As of June 9, 1961

Party Lineups

	Dem.	GOP	Vacancies
HOUSE	262	174	1
SENATE	65	35	0

BILL	HOUSE		SENATE		STATUS
Depressed Areas (S 1) (HR 4569)	Reported 3/22/61	Passed 3/29/61	Reported 3/8/61	Passed 3/15/61	PL 87-27 5/1/61
Minimum Wage (S 1457, S 895) (HR 3935)	Reported 3/13/61	Passed 3/24/61	Reported 4/12/61	Passed 4/20/61	PL 87-30 5/5/61
Aid to Education (S 1021) (HR 7300)	Reported 6/1/61		Reported 5/12/61	Passed 5/25/61	
College Aid (S 1241) (HR 7215)	Reported 5/26/61				
Omnibus Housing (S 1922) (HR 6028)	Reported 6/1/61		Reported 5/19/61	Debate Underway	
Temporary Unemployment Benefits (HR 4806)	Reported 2/25/61	Passed 3/1/61	Reported 3/15/61	Passed 3/16/61	PL 87-6 3/24/61
Medical Aid to the Aged (S 909) (HR 4222)					
Social Security Changes (HR 6027)	Reported 4/7/61	Passed 4/20/61	Hearings Completed		
Dependent Children Aid (HR 4884)	Reported 2/27/61	Passed 3/10/61	Reported 4/14/61	Passed 4/20/61	PL 87-31 5/8/61
Sugar Act Extension (HR 5463)	Reported 3/14/61	Passed 3/21/61	Reported 3/28/61	Passed 3/29/61	PL 87-15 3/31/61
Feed Grains Program (S 993) (HR 4510)	Reported 2/27/61	Passed 3/9/61	Reported 3/2/61	Passed 3/10/61	PL 87-5 3/22/61
Mexican Farm Workers (HR 2010)	Reported 4/24/61	Passed 5/11/61	Hearings Scheduled		
Omnibus Farm Bill (S 1643) (HR 6400)	Hearings Completed		Hearings Completed		
Mutual Security (S 1983) (HR 7372)	Hearings Underway		Hearings Underway		
OECD Treaty (Exec. E, 87th Cong. 1st Sess.)	No House Action Needed		Reported 3/8/61	Passed 3/16/61	Signed 3/23/61
Peace Corps (S 2000)					
Reorganization Act (S 153)	Reported 3/23/61	Passed 3/29/61	Reported 1/30/61	Passed 2/6/61	PL 87-18 4/7/61
Judgeships (S 912)	Reported 3/30/61	Passed 4/19/61	Reported 2/28/61	Passed 3/3/61	PL 87-36 5/19/61
Civil Rights (S 1817-20, S J Res 81-82) (HR 6875-77, HR 6890, H J Res 403-4)					
Tax Revision	Hearings Completed				
Highway Financing (HR 6713)	Reported 5/1/61	Passed 5/4/61	Hearings Completed		
Water Pollution (S 861) (HR 6441)	Reported 4/25/61	Passed 5/3/61	Reported 6/7/61		
Tax Extension (HR 7446)	Reported 6/5/61	Passed 6/8/61			
Airport Grants (S 1703) (HR 6580)	Hearings Completed		Hearings Scheduled		
Regulatory Agency Reform					

CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY

A service for editors and standard reference on U.S. Congress

Editor and President: Henrietta and Nelson Poynter.

Executive Editor: Thomas N. Schroth.

Senior Writers: Elizabeth J. Brenner, Robert C. Keith, William A. Korn, Helene C. Monberg, Neal R. Peirce.

Research Writers: Stephen Chatrnick, Ruth Hussey, Elizabeth M. James, Carolyn Mathiasen, Gladys Miller, Jonas V. Morris, David C. Niblack, Shirley Seib, Wayne Walker.

C.Q. Almanac Editor: Georgianna F. Rathbun.

Editorial Assistants: Barbara Gauntt, Charles D. McCamey, Roberta E. Russell, James C. Whittemore.

Publisher: Buel F. Weare.

Business Manager: Walter E. Thomas.

Production Supervisor: Walter W. Conklin, Jr.

Copyright 1961 by Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1156 Nineteenth St. N.W., Washington 6, D.C. All reproduction rights, including quotation, broadcasting and publication, are reserved for current editorial clients. Second rights are reserved, including use of Congressional Quarterly material in campaign supplements, advertisements and handbooks without special permission. Rates are based on membership and/or circulation of clients and will be furnished on request. Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

TAX RATE EXTENSION

The House June 8, by a 295-88 roll-call vote, passed and sent to the Senate a bill (HR 7446) to extend for one year the current corporate income tax rate, excise tax rates on automobiles, liquor and tobacco, and taxes on local telephone calls and passenger transportation. Prior to passage a motion to recommit the measure to the Ways and Means Committee, with instructions to report it back with an amendment repealing the 10 percent transportation tax, was offered by Rep. Bruce Alger (R Texas). It was rejected by a 189-196 roll-call vote. Republicans supported the motion, 146-7; Democrats opposed it, 43-189. (For voting, see chart p. 972) The bill was debated under a closed rule barring amendments.

Supporters of the recommittal motion charged that the 10 percent tax on railroad, air, water and bus travel contributed to the current "plight" of the transportation industry. Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur D. Mills (D Ark.) said the Committee favored a general revision of taxes, scheduled for consideration in 1962, in preference to piecemeal adjustment of tax rates. A. Sydney Herlong Jr. (D Fla.) said repeal of the transportation tax would cost the Government \$300 million in the first year.

BACKGROUND -- HR 7446 was reported (H Rept 450) June 5 by the Ways and Means Committee. (Weekly Report p. 916)

The report said the "status" of the fiscal 1962 budget was "an impelling reason for the continuation of the present corporate and excise tax rates," as requested by President Kennedy in his April 20 tax message. (Weekly Report p. 691) If the taxes were not extended, it said, the estimated loss of revenue in fiscal 1962 would be over \$2.5 billion.

The report said the Committee did not act on the President's request for an aviation fuel tax because public hearings on the proposal "developed information that indicated further study should be made of the impact of the transportation tax on the transportation industry and of the impact of the proposed aviation fuel tax on the airline segment of that industry." The Committee had directed a study by interested executive departments and agencies, the report said.

In supplemental views, Republican Committee Members Noah M. Mason (Ill.), John W. Byrnes (Wis.), Howard H. Baker (Tenn.), Thomas B. Curtis (Mo.), Victor A. Knox (Mich.), James B. Utt (Calif.), Jackson E. Betts (Ohio), Bruce Alger (Texas), Steven B. Derounian (N.Y.), and Herman T. Schneebeli (Pa.) said they were "convinced that the retention of the tax on transportation of persons is not in the national interest." They said the tax discriminated against domestic travel, compared to foreign travel, and had necessitated "Government subsidization of segments of the transportation industry.... The apparent compulsion of the Administration to spend ever-mounting sums for programs of relatively less priority than the urgent requirements for a sound transportation system causes us to support the repeal of the 10 percent transportation tax even under conditions of a budgetary deficit," they said.

PROVISIONS -- As passed by the House, HR 7446, the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1961:

Continued until July 1, 1962 the 52 percent tax rate on corporations and certain mutual insurance companies; the excise rates set by the Revenue Act of 1951 on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, passenger cars and automobile parts and accessories; the 10 percent tax on passenger transportation; and the 10 percent tax on local telephone service.

HOUSING BILL

The Senate June 1 began debate on the Housing Act of 1961 (S 1922), to authorize \$6,190,000,000 for existing or new housing programs. (For provisions, see Weekly Report p. 898) On the same day a \$4.9 billion housing bill was reported to the House. (See below. For comparison of funds in the Senate and House bills, see chart, next page.)

At 1:35 a.m. June 9 the Senate concluded consideration of amendments to the bill, but put off the final vote on passage to June 12. After a series of see-sawing votes, the bill's floor manager, Sen. John J. Sparkman (D Ala.), had beaten back all but one attempt to cut key sections of the bill.

As expected, the most controversial portions were those setting up 40-year, no-downpayment sales and rental housing programs for moderate-income families. Opposition to these provisions was led by Homer E. Capehart (R Ind.), ranking Republican member of the Banking and Currency Committee, and by Albert Gore (D Tenn.).

In addition to modifications made in the moderate-income housing plan, the Senate approved an amendment by Francis Case (R S.D.) to eliminate the \$100 million authorization for a new program to assist communities in open space development and other urban planning.

In a closely fought battle June 7 and 8, the Senate considered numerous amendments to the moderate-income housing provisions. The bill as reported from committee established two new categories of mortgage loans insurable by FHA: (1) Forty-year, no-downpayment, limited-interest (5 to 6 percent) loans, made to commercial developers, for construction or rehabilitation of housing for sale to moderate-income families; and (2) 40-year, no-downpayment, limited-interest loans (at below the market rate), made to non-profit organizations and public agencies, for construction and rehabilitation of five-family (or larger) rental dwellings for moderate-income families. The program was termed experimental, and FHA's authority to contract for guarantees on new 40-year loans was limited to July 1, 1963.

Opponents of the moderate-income section of the bill claimed that it was "unsound" and "impractical." Capehart said, "I do not see any necessity for the provision," which he claimed was injecting into the bill "public housing for so-called middle-income people." Opponents also said the 40-year term was too long, since the buyer would build up very little equity in the home for many years. Gore agreed with this view, adding that the provision was not "poor man's" legislation and actually would contribute little to the encouragement of private home ownership.

Defending the section, Sparkman said, "the price of housing has been continually rising," and 65 percent of American families have incomes too low "to purchase the typical FHA house" but too high to qualify for low-cost public housing.

The first vote on the moderate-income housing plan came June 7 on an amendment by Capehart to delete the section encouraging non-profit organizations and public agencies to build rental housing under what Sparkman conceded was a "subsidized" interest rate of 3-1/8 percent. The amendment was defeated on a roll-call vote, 41-50, with 14 Democrats joining 27 Republicans in support. Only four GOP members voted against the amendment. The Senate then killed, 25-64, a substitute for the Administration program, offered by Jacob K. Javits (R N.Y.), to establish a Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation to assist in providing housing for families of moderate income. (For voting, see chart p. 968)

On June 8 the Senate defeated on a 39-57 roll-call vote another Capehart amendment. It would have reduced to 30 years the maximum term of the sales housing plan for moderate-income families. The amendment would have permitted a home buyer to make payments on the basis of a 40-year mortgage for the first five years, on the basis of a 30-year mortgage for the next five years,

Cost Estimates

The following figures compare the program authorizations under the Senate and House versions of the housing bills, as reported from committee:

Program	Under S 1922	Under HR 6028
FNMA	\$ 750,000,000	\$ 750,000,000
College housing loans	1,350,000,000	1,200,000,000
Community facilities loans	50,000,000	500,000,000
Mass-transport loans	100,000,000	-----
Elderly housing revolving fund	50,000,000	100,000,000
Urban renewal grants	2,500,000,000	2,000,000,000
Urban planning grants	80,000,000	30,000,000
Public housing demonstration grants	10,000,000	-----
Open space grants	100,000,000	100,000,000
VA direct loans	1,200,000,000	-----*
Farm housing loans	-----**	200,000,000
Other programs	-----	51,000,000
TOTALS	\$6,190,000,000	\$4,931,000,000
Public housing units***	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000

*House April 13 passed a bill (HR 5723) authorizing an additional \$1,200,000,000 for the veterans' direct-loan program.

**Senate bill extended the existing \$207,000,000 authorization; the House bill added an additional \$200,000,000, for a \$407,000,000 total.

***\$336,000,000 previously authorized.

and on the basis of a 20-year mortgage for the final 20-year period.

In a surprise move the Senate then voted, 49-44, to eliminate from the bill both the sales and rental moderate-income housing programs. The amendment, offered by Gore, was supported by 19 Democrats and 30 Republicans, opposed by 41 Democrats and three Republicans. Until passage of the Gore amendment, Administration leaders were confident the bill would pass the Senate without substantial change. (For voting, see chart p. 969)

A few hours later, the Senate reversed itself and approved, 47-42, a substitute amendment by Sparkman which restored the moderate-income housing program in modified form. Forty-three Democrats and four Republicans supported the Sparkman amendment, while 27 Republicans and 15 Democrats remained in opposition. The Sparkman amendment was the same as the bill's original moderate-income plan except that for sales housing a downpayment of 3 percent on the first \$13,500 and 10 percent on the remainder, up to a maximum cost of \$15,000, was required. The original bill required no downpayment. Before final approval the Sparkman substitute was amended by two Capehart amendments accepted by voice vote. One eliminated public agencies from the rental housing program and the other required that uniform interest rates be established for all classes of borrowers. The Sparkman amendment narrowly survived, by a vote of 45-46, an amendment by Prescott Bush (R Conn.) to limit the below-market-rate rental program to displaced families only. A Capehart motion to table the Sparkman substitute was also defeated on a 42-46 roll-call vote. A Gore amendment to limit the moderate-income program loans to 30 years was defeated when a motion by Wayne Morse (D Ore.) to table it was agreed to on a 47-45 roll-call vote.

OTHER AMENDMENTS

In action on other major amendments, the Senate June 8 turned down by a 34-58 roll-call vote a Capehart amendment to reduce from 100,000 to 37,000 the number of low-rent public housing units authorized under the bill. Capehart also sought to reduce by \$700 million the \$2.5 billion authorized for urban renewal grants, but the amendment was defeated on a 38-55 roll call. By a 43-51 roll-call vote the Senate also rejected an amendment by Hubert H. Humphrey (D Minn.) which would have raised from two-thirds to three-fourths the federal share of urban renewal grants to distressed area cities with populations under 150,000.

An amendment to kill a \$50 million authorization for mass transportation demonstration projects was defeated on a 44-46 roll-call vote. The amendment was submitted by Frank Lausche (D Ohio). A point of order made by Lausche was sustained against an amendment by Joseph S. Clark (D Pa.) which would have provided \$500,000 a year for three years for city planning and urban studies fellowships.

In debate on the home improvement and rehabilitation program, which would supplement the existing \$3,500, five-year program, the Senate rejected on a 35-56 roll-call vote June 7 a Capehart amendment to cut the maximum loan from \$10,000 to \$7,000 and the maximum term from 25 to 15 years. At Sparkman's suggestion, another Capehart amendment was then accepted on a voice vote, reducing the maximum term to 20 years and providing that such loans must be limited to homes at least 10 years old. The aim of the new program was to rehabilitate

old housing instead of tearing it down, thus making more housing available to moderate-income families.

Among amendments approved by voice vote June 8 was one by Jack Miller (R Iowa) to permit civil defense fallout shelters to be included in demonstration projects under the public housing section of the bill. On June 7 the Senate approved an amendment by George A. Smathers (D Fla.) to permit construction under the elderly housing program of apartments with one or two bedrooms rather than only efficiency-type units. Also approved was an amendment by J.W. Fulbright (D Ark.) to authorize federal savings and loan associations to lend a maximum of \$250,000 to state business development credit corporations where state associations are permitted under local law to make such loans in their states.

(Full provisions of the bill as passed, all roll-call votes taken June 8, and all amendments accepted and rejected will appear in the next Weekly Report.)

In general debate on the bill June 1 and 2, Banking Committee Chairman A. Willis Robertson (D Va.) said it was "extravagant and inflationary" and largely supported by "some kind of backdoor Treasury financing."

Sparkman said the principal aim of the bill was to stimulate construction of housing through the private enterprise system and in an atmosphere of concern about the state of the national economy and "the continued lack of sustained vitality shown in the homebuilding industry."

Sen. Wallace F. Bennett (R Utah), in commenting on the bill's cost, said he would not be so concerned about "such extravagance if I thought that our housing situation justified it." He said the facts did not bear out the contention that a large number of citizens are homeless.

Prescott Bush (R Conn.) objected to "lumping all these programs -- some sound, others questionable -- into an omnibus bill, and presenting it to the Senate on a take-it-or-leave-it-basis."

HOUSE BILL

COMMITTEE -- House Banking and Currency. **ACTION** -- June 1 reported an amended omnibus housing bill (HR 6028 -- H Rept 447). The Committee had approved the bill May 26, by a 13-5 vote, in substantially the same form as approved by the Housing Subcommittee May 24. (Weekly Report p. 900)

The only significant amendments of the full Committee were made in provisions that permitted distressed-area cities with a population of 100,000 or less to obtain federal grants for three-fourths of the cost of a project under the urban renewal program, instead of the regular two-thirds grant, and to participate in the community facilities loan program. The Committee raised the population limit from 100,000 to 150,000.

The Committee termed the bill "a much-needed forward step" and said it represented "a well-thought-out program" which would make possible "an accelerated attack on the problems of urban blight and improving housing conditions, and aiding orderly growth of small and large communities alike." Singled out for special attention were the moderate-income housing portions of the bill. The Committee said housing for families of modest income was a "neglected area" and that the facts refuted the contention that no problem existed.

Excluding the cost of public housing grants, the Committee estimated that total new authorizations under the bill would amount to \$4,931,000,000.

In separate views, 10 Republican members of the Committee said the overriding issue in the housing bill was "fiscal responsibility." The bill, they said, contained "excessive budget spending authorizations" as well as "unsound and unnecessary provisions."

The minority said the bill authorized \$8.8 billion in "backdoor spending," including \$3,146,000,000 for public housing grants, and \$248.5 million through the regular appropriations process. Rep. Paul A. Fino (R N.Y.) and Rep. Seymour Halpern (R N.Y.) were the only GOP members who did not sign the minority report.

PL 480 EXTENSION

The Senate June 1 passed by voice vote and sent to the House a bill (S 1720) to extend until Dec. 31, 1961 the President's authority to use grants of surplus farm commodities to promote economic development in underdeveloped countries. The authority was contained in Title II of PL 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended by the 1960 Mutual Security Act. The surplus food is used for payment of wages-in-kind to workers on roads, dams and other projects abroad.

The bill as passed was in the form recommended by the Foreign Relations Committee May 26. (Weekly Report p. 916)

RELATED DEVELOPMENT -- The Senate June 1 adopted a resolution (S Res 128 -- S Rept 291) favoring establishment under the United Nations of an international food and raw materials reserve.

DISABLED VETERANS

The House June 5 passed by voice vote and sent to the Senate a bill (HR 879) to raise compensation payments to veterans with service-connected disabilities. No opposition was expressed. The first-year cost of the bill was estimated at \$87,933,144, and the number of veterans eligible at 1,934,509. President Kennedy April 27 submitted to Congress a proposal, drafted by the Veterans Administration, calling for approximately \$65 million in compensation increases. (Weekly Report p. 822)

HR 879 carried out the President's dual request that veterans be compensated for the rise in the cost of living since the last increase in 1957 and that those with the more severe injuries receive proportionately higher increases. Under the bill, the 1,552,657 veterans with less than 50 percent disability received increases roughly comparable to the 5.4 percent rise in living costs (they ranged from \$1 to \$4 more per month). The remaining 381,852 veterans received higher increases: from 6 to 8.9 percent for those with 50 to 100 percent disability and from 7.5 to 16.7 percent for those who receive additional, statutory awards for anatomical losses (the range was from \$6 to \$50 more per month.)

Over-all, the increases averaged 9.2 percent.

BACKGROUND -- Congress in 1957 voted a minimum 10 percent increase in compensation payments for veterans and their dependents (PL 85-168) at an estimated first-year cost of \$169,707,000. (1957 Almanac p. 669)

The House Veterans' Affairs Compensation and Pensions Subcommittee held hearings April 25-27 and May 10, 1961 on 64 compensation bills. The Committee reported HR 879 May 26 (H Rept 436).

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

The Senate June 7 passed by voice vote and sent to conference an amended bill (HR 6345) making definite appropriations of \$790,591,850 for the Interior Department and related agencies during fiscal 1962. In addition, the bill estimated indefinite appropriations at \$12,808,000 and set the borrowing authority for the Interior Department's helium program at \$10,000,000. The bill included funds for the Agriculture Department's Forest Service and the Health, Education and Welfare Department's Indian health activities, but omitted Interior's power and reclamation activities.

As passed by the Senate, HR 6345 appropriated \$60,080,850 more than was voted by the House and \$30,337,850 more than was requested by the President.

Prior to passage, the Senate accepted floor amendments reducing, by a net \$9,250,000, the \$799,841,850 in definite appropriations recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee. An amendment by Minority Leader Everett McKinley Dirksen (R Ill.), accepted on a 77-13 roll-call vote, cut \$10 million from the \$30 million increase over the President's request that the Committee recommended for additional protection and management of forest lands. As sent to conference, the bill provided \$139,200,200 for forest land management. (For voting, see chart p. 968)

Opposition to Dirksen's amendment was based on the grounds that the entire amount was necessary to maintain the schedule of the Forest Service and that the funds would be used for increasing employment in forested areas.

A second amendment, by Ernest Gruening (D Alaska), accepted on a 48-43 roll call, provided \$375,000 to rehabilitate a surplus ship to replace the NorthStar, which was operated by the Interior Department's Bureau of Indian Affairs to service ports in Northern Alaska. The House had approved the budget request for the funds but the Senate Committee deleted it. Gruening said that of the 98 ports visited by the North Star, only eight were also visited by commercial vessels, so that inhabitants in those areas depended almost entirely on the North Star for supplies. Opposition was led by Karl E. Mundt (R S.D.), who called the proposal "a socialistic steamship operating in competition with private enterprise."

BACKGROUND -- The House April 18, in passing HR 6345, made total appropriations of \$753,319,000. (Weekly Report p. 664)

The Senate Appropriations Committee June 2 reported HR 6345 (S Rept 294), increasing the amount approved by the House by \$69,330,850 in definite appropriations, for a total of \$799,841,850. The Committee approved the indefinite appropriations and borrowing authority voted by the House.

The bill as reported was \$40,262,850 over the amount requested by the Administration. Of the increase, \$30 million was for additional protection and management of forest lands, and \$7 million was for other forest programs. The report said the Committee was of the "firm conviction" that additional access roads would open up "vast areas of marketable timber to sustained-yield use." The income from the additional timber, the report said, probably would "more than repay" the \$3 million non-budgeted increase provided.

Although the Committee concurred in the House provision of \$10 million in borrowing authority for the helium conservation program, it recommended the full \$60

million requested by the Interior Department in contract authority for annual helium purchases. The report said eight or 10 contracts probably would be executed before Jan. 1, 1962. The House had permitted only \$35 million in contract authority in the belief that only four contracts would be negotiated in fiscal 1962.

As reported, HR 6345 provided \$63,875,000 for the Health, Education and Welfare Department's Indian health activities and facilities. It represented an increase in the budget request and in the House allowance of \$4,829,000.

The Committee concurred with the House in rejecting a March 24 request by President Kennedy to give each department and agency authority for the transfer of certain funds and personnel within the agency. (Weekly Report p. 553).

PROVISIONS -- The breakdown of funds in HR 6345, as passed by the Senate:

Interior Department	\$475,959,650
Agriculture Department,	
Forest Service	222,863,200
Health, Education and Welfare	
Department, Indian health	63,875,000
Other related agencies	27,894,000
TOTAL	\$790,591,850
Indefinite appropriations	(12,808,000)
Borrowing authority (helium	
program)	(10,000,000)
GRAND TOTAL	\$813,399,850

AMENDMENTS ACCEPTED

June 6 -- Francis Case (R S.D.) -- Add \$75,000 to National Park funds for construction of additional public facilities at Mt. Rushmore National Memorial in South Dakota. Voice vote.

June 7 -- Dirksen -- Reduce by \$10 million to \$139,200,200, the appropriation for the protection and management of forest lands. Roll-call vote, 77-13.

Gruening -- Add \$375,000 for a rehabilitated Indian Affairs Bureau ship to service ports in Northern Alaska. Roll call, 48-43.

William Proxmire (D Wis.) -- Reinsert \$300,000 for planning additional facilities at the Forest Products Laboratory, Madison, Wis. Voice.

WHITE FLEET

The Senate June 1 adopted by voice vote a resolution (S Res 154) favoring establishment of a White Fleet to aid disaster-struck nations. The resolution expressed the sense of the Senate that the President should assign mothballed U.S. ships for operation by philanthropic groups at any time he determined it would be in the national interest to provide emergency aid to foreign coastal areas suffering from famine, epidemic, earthquakes and other disasters.

BACKGROUND -- S Res 154 was reported (S Rept 292) May 29 by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as a substitute for a bill (S 324) that would have amended the Mutual Security Act for the same purpose. The report said use of a former Navy hospital ship for training foreign medical personnel under Project Hope had "clearly demonstrated" that a White Fleet "would be in the national interest."

AGRICULTURE FUNDS

The House June 6 passed by a 318-65 roll-call vote and sent to the Senate a bill (HR 7444) appropriating \$5,948,466,000 for the Agriculture Department in fiscal 1962. President Kennedy had requested \$6,089,244,000 in appropriations, \$140,778,000 more than the House approved. The amended bill appropriated approximately \$1.4 billion for regular activities of the Department, \$1.6 billion for foreign assistance programs (principally disposal of farm surpluses abroad), and \$3 billion to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for price support and foreign assistance programs of earlier years. (For voting, see chart p. 968)

For the first time the agriculture bill contained current-year appropriations for the foreign assistance programs, putting them on a "pay-as-you-go" basis so as not to tie-up CCC funds that might be needed for price support payments. The bill included \$1,951,915,000 to reimburse the CCC for funds expended on foreign assistance and special milk programs in fiscal 1961 -- presumably the last time the ex post facto funding arrangement for the programs would be necessary.

The bill was passed after a brief controversy over the calendar 1962 authorization for Agricultural Conservation Program payments. The House Appropriations Committee recommended an authorization of \$250 million -- \$100 million more than President Kennedy requested and \$150 million more than the Eisenhower budget proposed. An amendment by Rep. Henry S. Reuss (D Wis.) to cut the figure back to \$150 million first was accepted on a standing vote but later was rejected on a 184-196 roll-call vote. Democrats opposed the amendment, 80-148; Republicans supported it, 104-48. The bill contained an appropriation of \$238 million to pay for the 1961 ACP outlay.

The only change in the bill as reported from committee was deletion of \$100,000 to celebrate the centennial of the Agriculture Department in 1962. It was ruled out of order as legislation in an appropriation bill. A similar ruling defeated an attempt by William H. Avery (R Kan.) to set a \$50,000 limit on price support payments to any person.

BACKGROUND -- HR 7444 was reported (H Rept 448) June 2 by the House Appropriations Committee with recommendations to cut Mr. Kennedy's requests by \$140,678,000. The major cuts were \$60 million from the \$1.3 billion requested for sales of surpluses for foreign currencies under PL 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; \$50 million from the \$175 million proposed for bartered materials to be added to the Government's supplemental stockpile; and \$30 million from the \$330 million requested for conservation reserve payments incurred under the soil bank program that expired in 1960.

Two increases over Mr. Kennedy's appropriation requests were recommended; \$5,537,000, for a total of \$25 million to speed work on 11 major watersheds initiated in 1944; and \$5 million additional for the school lunch program, making \$170 million available for it.

The Committee voted \$117,900,000 more in authorizations than the President asked. The major increase was \$100 million for the 1962 Agricultural Conservation Program, for which \$250 million was authorized. The Committee said it was the sixth time in nine years that it had increased budget requests for the ACP, fighting off "efforts to cripple this vital program," the report

said. The Committee also increased by \$17.9 million the authorization for farm operating loans issued by the Farmers Home Administration, making \$250 million available for the program.

New items carried in the bill were \$15 million for payments under the new feed grains law (PL 87-5 -- Weekly Report p. 479), a cut of \$5.5 million in the budget request, and \$1 million for a contingency fund to meet special agricultural research needs.

In expressing its approval of putting foreign assistance programs on a "pay-as-you-go" basis, the Committee said over \$2.5 billion of CCC funds in fiscal 1961 were "tied up in these special and unrelated programs." Moreover, "the tendency of the general public and the press to charge the cost of these multi-billion dollar programs to the Department of Agriculture, and to American agriculture, is unfortunate." As of June 30, the CCC was expected to "have available for price support operations only \$815 million or less," an "entirely inadequate" sum "if an unusual volume of price support activities should develop suddenly or if some new program should be undertaken," the report said.

Earlier in 1961, efforts to reimburse the CCC for \$2.8 billion spent on price support and foreign programs were rejected as part of the Third Supplemental bill for fiscal 1961. At that time the Appropriations Committee said the funds should be provided in the regular fiscal 1962 bill. (Weekly Report p. 612)

PROVISIONS -- As passed by the House, HR 7444 appropriated:

Regular Department activities	\$1,378,906,000
Foreign assistance programs	1,600,000,000
Restoration of CCC capital impairment (price supports, fiscal 1960)	1,017,610,000
Reimbursement to CCC for foreign programs, fiscal 1961	1,861,915,000
Reimbursement to CCC for special milk program, 1961	90,000,000
Interior Dept. waterfowl program	35,000
TOTAL	\$5,948,466,000

In addition, the bill authorized \$250 million for the ACP program in calendar 1962, \$345 million for Rural Electrification Administration loans and \$284.9 million for Farmers Home Administration loans.

AMENDMENT ACCEPTED

June 6 -- O.C. Fisher (D Texas) -- Authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to accept 35 acres of land at Kerrville, Texas, for an entomology research laboratory. Voice vote.

AMENDMENTS REJECTED

June 6 -- Henry S. Reuss (D Wis.) -- Reduce the \$250 million authorization for the Agricultural Conservation Program in calendar 1962 to \$150 million. Accepted on a standing vote, 107-65; rejected on a roll-call vote, 184-196.

Reuss -- Reduce the authority of county and state soil conservation committees over restrictions in eligibility requirements and cost-sharing. Standing, 26-98.

Clare E. Hoffman (R Mich.) -- Delete the \$1 million appropriation for the Agriculture Department library. Voice.

DEBATE -- June 6 -- Reuss -- Too many ACP payments go for "practices which have little to do with

permanently conserving our soil, but are primarily aimed at getting more production per acre." The Government pays "subsidies of \$70 million or more a year for fertilizer, largely lime and rock phosphate." The principal witness who testified for a \$100 million increase in the ACP authorization "was Robert M. Koch, president of the National Limestone Institute."

Jamie L. Whitten (D Miss.), floor manager of the bill -- No federal program "is a better investment than the ACP.... The practices are selected by the farmer himself.... One million participants put up an equal amount of money with the Government and supply their labor."

INDEPENDENT OFFICES FUNDS

The House June 7 passed by voice vote and sent to the Senate an amended bill (HR 7445) appropriating \$8,404,098,000 in fiscal 1962 for 17 independent agencies and for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, the National Aeronautics and Space Council and a disaster fund, which are part of the Executive Office of the President. The total was \$216,463,000 below the Administration's requests.

More than half the funds in the bill -- \$4.9 billion -- were designated for the Veterans Administration. The second largest sum, \$1.2 billion, was earmarked for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

On a point of order by H.R. Gross (R Iowa), \$25 million was cut from the appropriations for the General Services Administration for sites for new public buildings because the funds had not been authorized.

The House accepted, by a 116-45 teller vote, an amendment by Olin Teague (D Texas) restoring \$5 million deleted by the Appropriations Committee from funds for Veterans Administration construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities. The amendment gave the VA the full \$75 million requested by the Administration. Albert Thomas (D Texas), the bill's floor manager, said the money was not needed because the VA had an additional \$50 million in unobligated funds available for use in fiscal 1962.

By a voice vote the House rejected an amendment by John F. Baldwin (R Calif.) to add \$1,227,000 for the construction of a fallout shelter in a proposed new Executive Office building. Baldwin said if there was "any place where a (shelter) is needed it is in the building adjoining the White House," but Thomas said the money would be "thrown away" since a basement shelter could not accommodate the building's 11,000 occupants.

BACKGROUND -- The House Appropriations Committee June 2 reported HR 7445 (H Rept 449), with a reduction of \$201,463,000 in the budget request of \$8,625,561,000.

The measure provided \$79,167,000 for the OCDM -- \$25,033,000 less than was requested. The report said the \$79.2 million did not include funds for a strengthened civil defense program which the President May 25 said he would submit at a later date. (Weekly Report p. 919) The Committee, for the second consecutive year, disallowed the Administration's request -- approximately \$12 million for fiscal 1962 -- for fallout shelters in federal buildings.

HR 7445 as reported allowed \$83.7 million for the Civil Aeronautics Board, including \$74.8 million for subsidy payments for air service. The Committee warned that it was the last time it would recommend funds for subsidy payments for helicopter operations. For fiscal 1962, it cut the budget request for these payments from \$6.9 million to \$5 million.

The Committee also recommended a \$10 million cut, to \$30 million, for GSA's program of stockpiling strategic and critical materials. The report said over \$9 billion was "tied up in materials on hand or on order" for the stockpile and "more than 50 percent of it is excess to our national needs."

The Committee cut the Administration's request of \$1,235,300,000 for NASA by \$35.3 million, including a \$27.5 million cut in the request for research and development. The report said the appropriation was, in effect, the first payment on the agency's programs for fiscal 1962 and that its "over-all needs will be reviewed when hearings are held on the President's revised program."

Other agencies cut were: VA, \$45 million; FAA, \$21 million; HHFA, \$19 million; and National Science Foundation, \$27 million.

For salaries and expenses for six major regulatory agencies -- FCC, FPC, FTC, ICC, SEC and CAB -- the Committee recommended \$73,043,000 for fiscal 1962. This was \$6,240,000 more than fiscal 1961 appropriations and \$1,230,000 under the budget requests for fiscal 1962.

The number of additional jobs -- 629 in all -- which the funds would provide, according to the report, were as follows: FCC -- 50; FPC -- 82; FTC -- 230; ICC -- 44; SEC -- 153; CAB -- 70.

PROVISIONS -- As passed by the House, HR 7445 appropriated:

National Aeronautics and Space Council	\$ 320,000
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	79,167,000
Office of the President, disaster relief	6,000,000
Civil Aeronautics Board	83,700,000
Civil Service Commission	91,844,000
Federal Aviation Agency	723,500,000
Federal Communications Commission	12,400,000
Federal Power Commission	8,793,000
Federal Trade Commission	10,000,000
General Accounting Office	43,000,000
General Services Administration	510,390,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency	426,918,000
Interstate Commerce Commission	21,950,000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	1,200,000,000
National Capital Housing Authority	40,000
National Science Foundation	250,000,000
Renegotiation Board	2,900,000
Securities and Exchange Commission	11,000,000
Selective Service System	33,670,000
Veterans Administration	4,884,571,000
TOTAL	\$8,400,163,000
Indefinite appropriations	(3,935,000)
GRAND TOTAL	\$8,404,098,000

AMENDMENT ACCEPTED

June 7 -- Olin E. Teague (D Texas) -- Add \$5 million to the VA's appropriation for construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities. Teller vote, 116-45.

AMENDMENT REJECTED

June 7 -- John F. Baldwin (R Calif.) -- Add \$1,227,000 to the appropriation of a new Executive Office building for the construction of a fallout shelter. Voice vote.

VOLUNTARY PENSION PLANS

The House June 5 passed by voice vote and sent to the Senate a bill (HR 10) to permit self-employed persons to defer payment of income taxes on portions of their income put into retirement funds. It was the third time the House had passed such legislation, estimated to cover about seven million persons.

The Treasury Department, which opposed the bill on grounds it should be delayed until the Administration framed a broad tax revision program, estimated the revenue loss in the first full year of operation at \$358 million.

There was bipartisan support and little opposition during floor debate on the bill. Congressmen agreed on the need to correct tax inequities they said deprived the self-employed of benefits accorded corporation employees, and many deplored the lag in passing such legislation despite support for it over a 10-year period. Rep. Eugene J. Keogh (D N.Y.), who introduced HR 10 as well as its earliest predecessor in 1951, told the House the bill had the support of 69 national professional and businessmen's groups and that 37 similar bills had been introduced during the session by Representatives of both parties. Among the groups backing HR 10 were: the American Bar Assn., American Medical Assn., Assn. of Stock Exchange Firms, National Assn. of Homebuilders of the U.S., National Automobile Dealers Assn., National Farmers Union, National Grange and the National Restaurant Assn.

BACKGROUND -- HR 10 was passed by the House in 1958 but rejected by the Senate when offered as an amendment to another bill. An identical bill passed the House in 1959, was reported to the Senate in 1960 but did not pass. (1960 Almanac p. 265)

The current bill was reported, with amendments, by the House Ways and Means Committee May 9.

PROVISIONS -- See Weekly Report p. 840.

DEBATE -- June 5 -- Thomas B. Curtis (R Mo.) -- It was "foolhardy" to continue acting on such measures, "knowing full well that they have not been budgeted and, therefore, the Administration in some way or other is going to defeat the legislation, and on sound basis."

Howard H. Baker (R Tenn.) -- "The way to get this bill budgeted is to pass it" by such a large vote the Administration would not want to veto it.

John E. Fogarty (DR.I.) -- To implement and enforce the bill will not be easy "because of the very nature of the income we are trying to protect," but there was "convincing evidence" the legislation was needed.

Robert T. Stafford (R Vt.) -- HR 10 "will assist a large group of Americans in providing for their own well-being, instead of relying on the Government."

STATE, JUSTICE FUNDS

The House June 1 passed by a 256-71 roll-call vote and sent to the Senate, without amendment, a bill (HR 7371) appropriating \$745,000,050 for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary and related agencies in fiscal 1962 plus an estimated \$6,300,000 from special account appropriations for payment to court referees. (For voting, see chart p. 967)

The House rejected three amendments by H.R. Gross (R Iowa) to eliminate funds for the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, to eliminate the U.S. Information Agency representation (entertainment) allowance, and to reduce the State Department representation allowance

from \$925,000 to \$400,000. Rep. John J. Rooney (D N.Y.), floor manager of the bill, told Gross that "entertainment is a necessary prerequisite to diplomatic relations." The State Department, which had received \$872,000 for entertainment expenses in fiscal 1961, asked for \$954,000 in fiscal 1962.

BACKGROUND -- The House Appropriations Committee May 29 reported the bill (H Rept 442). The Committee recommended \$751,300,050 in appropriations, an increase of \$4,925,060 over the fiscal 1961 appropriations but \$54,284,152 less than had been requested.

The Committee cut \$31,890,000 from State Department requests. The Committee agreed to a March 17 Department request to defer consideration of a \$9,693,000 estimate for the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West, authorized in 1960 for construction in Hawaii. (1960 Almanac p. 168) A \$20 million request for acquisition and maintenance of buildings abroad was cut to \$10 million to comply with the current authorization. The Committee also recommended a cut of \$4.6 million from the international educational exchange activities request.

Justice Department requests were cut by \$4,144,100 but the Committee recommended the full \$5.5 million requested for the antitrust division. The Committee also recommended appropriation of the full \$127,216,000 requested by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, making the 10th consecutive year the FBI received the full amount requested.

The Committee cut \$16,697,500 from the U.S. Information Agency request. Although it cut \$9.6 million from the proposed salaries and expense appropriation, the Committee did permit an increase of \$9,169,700 which, with "more effective and efficient use" of current personnel would, it said, allow USIA to expand its program in Africa and South America. The Committee recommended the full amount requested for the Voice of America, \$19,064,400.

The report recommended that the Commission on Civil Rights receive the \$302,000 requested. The Judiciary request for \$56,050,202 was cut by \$1,552,552.

The Committee directed the State Department and USIA to use approximately 15 percent of their appropriations to purchase U.S.-owned foreign currencies from the Treasury, in order to reduce dollar expenditures abroad. The sums earmarked for foreign currency purchases were \$41,200,000 for State and \$21,750,000 for USIA.

PROVISIONS -- As passed by the House, HR 7371 appropriated:

State Department	\$267,478,000
Justice Department	294,239,900
Judiciary	48,197,650
U.S. Information Agency	134,782,500
Civil Rights Commission	302,000
TOTAL	\$745,000,050
Special Accounts	(\$6,300,000)
GRAND TOTAL	\$751,300,050

AMENDMENTS REJECTED

June 1 -- Gross -- Cut State Department representation allowances from \$925,000 to \$400,000. Standing, 33-51.

Gross -- Eliminate entire appropriation of \$125,000 for the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO. Voice.

Gross -- Eliminate the \$100,000 USIA representation allowance. Voice.



Around The Capitol

PRESIDENT REPORTS ON PARIS, VIENNA, LONDON TALKS

President Kennedy June 8 said the United States had no intention of resuming nuclear tests, despite the disappointing outcome of his talks on that subject with Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev during his May 31-June 5 trip abroad. He also said the U.S. would continue its efforts for an effective cease-fire in Laos, despite an intensified Communist-led attack there. The President's statements, in an address to newspaper editors, came as international conferences in Geneva on Laos and nuclear testing both were deadlocked. (Weekly Report p. 877)

Highlights of the President's trip:

Meeting with de Gaulle -- President Kennedy May 31-June 2 met in Paris with French President Charles de Gaulle. A June 3 official communique on the meetings said the two leaders had "confirmed the identity of their views on their commitments and responsibilities toward Berlin," and "set forth fully the respective positions of the two countries." (See text p. 965)

Mr. Kennedy told a June 1 meeting in Paris of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Council "our problem is to give new life to the NATO Council and to the organization," and it was of "vital strategic significance" to "concern ourselves with the whole southern half of the globe where we are now in danger...."

The President told a June 2 press conference he regarded his talks with General de Gaulle as "most valuable" and he hoped there would be U.S.-French consultation "with increasing intimacy in the months ahead." (See text p. 962)

Meeting with Khrushchev -- Mr. Kennedy and Soviet Premier Khrushchev met in Vienna June 3-4. A June 4 joint communique said they had "agreed to maintain contact on all questions of interest to the two countries and for the whole world." (See text p. 966) During the meetings, White House Press Secretary Pierre Salinger described them as "frank, courteous and wide-ranging." Khrushchev June 4 said the talks were "useful" and "a very good beginning" toward improving relations.

Meeting with Macmillan -- Mr. Kennedy and British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan June 5 met in London, and a joint communique said they "noted with satisfaction the agreement in Vienna on the need for an effective cease-fire" in Laos and also gave "particular attention" to the nuclear test conference and the question of disarmament. (See text p. 966) President and Mrs. Kennedy were dinner guests of Queen Elizabeth and Prince Philip, and the event marked the first visit of an American President to Buckingham Palace since that of Woodrow Wilson in 1918.

DESCRIBES MEETINGS

The President June 6 briefed Congressional leaders on the meeting and reportedly told them these were Khrushchev's views: he was vitally interested in only two subjects -- Berlin and a change in the secretariat direction of the United Nations; he did not regard Cuban Premier Fidel Castro as a Communist, but regarded him

as unstable; he intended to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany, and nobody but the U.S. still believed East and West Germany could be reunited; he was not interested in trying to make the Laos government Communist.

In a radio-television report to the nation the same day, Mr. Kennedy said of his Vienna talks with Khrushchev: the "one area which afforded some immediate prospect of accord was Laos," with both sides recognizing the need to reduce the "dangers" there; U.S. hopes for an end to nuclear tests were "struck a serious blow" since Khrushchev "made it clear there could not be a neutral administrator"; the "most somber talks" were on Germany and Berlin; Khrushchev predicted the "triumph of communism in the new and less developed countries," and to meet this challenge it was "vitally important" for the U.S. to continue meeting its obligations in foreign aid. Of his talks in Paris with President Charles de Gaulle, he said: they were "profoundly encouraging" and "certain doubts and suspicions that might have come up in a long time were removed on both sides." He said his visit with British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan brought agreement "there is work to be done in the West" and they reached decisions on the steps to take. (For text see p. 960)

Chairman J.W. Fulbright (D Ark.) of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee said the report indicated "our relations with Russia are very serious and we should not minimize the difficulties we will face in the coming months." Senate Minority Leader Everett McKinley Dirksen (R Ill.) June 8 said he approved of Mr. Kennedy's report, but "we suggest that instead of spending our energies in planning further negotiations we devote our energies to vigorous moves which the Kremlin will understand."

LAOS, TEST BAN TALKS

President Kennedy told the June 8 meeting of newspaper editors that if it was impossible to reach agreement on the relatively simple matter of an effective cease-fire, "then how difficult -- if not impossible -- it would be to reach agreement on any other question." "I think we'll stay at Geneva and see if we can come to a neutral and independent Laos," he said. Referring to the nuclear test ban talks, the President said "I think it is important that we continue (to negotiate for a guaranteed ban) even though our progress was not hopeful at Vienna... 'I want it to be clear that, if we cannot find agreement, the United States went to every length to reach one.'" Mr. Kennedy also said, "I know of no test which is now necessary for our program in outer space."

The 14-nation conference on Laos opened May 16 but quickly deadlocked amid reports of numerous truce violations and disagreements over adequate policing of the truce. (Weekly Report p. 846)

(Great Britain, co-chairman along with the Soviet Union for the Geneva Conference on Laos, June 8

announced indefinite postponement of the meetings because of "apparent serious violation" of the cease-fire. The action followed the June 7 fall of Padong, a Laotian strongpoint, under an all-out assault by pro-Communist Pathet Lao rebels. W. Averell Harriman, Chief U.S. delegate to the conference, June 7 called the attack a "blatant violation" of the cease-fire, but the State Department the same day said the U.S. would not cause a collapse of the conference by calling its delegates home.)

(The Geneva nuclear test ban conference, suspended Sept. 27, 1960, reopened March 21. (Weekly Report p. 877)

(The U.S. and Great Britain May 29 proposed a compromise to meet Russian objections to its earlier plan for 20 inspections a year, by proposing 12 a year, with an additional one inspection for every five unidentified events reported by the control system, up to an annual ceiling of 20. Soviet Delegate Semyon Tsarapkin said the West was insisting on an "unrealistic relationship" between the number of seismic events and size of the quota, and on May 31 he termed the proposal "unacceptable" when it was presented as a draft treaty. British Delegate Sir Michael Wright replied that, "if your policy is to reject any proposal without time to consider it, then I conclude your Government has lost the will to negotiate." U.S. Delegate Arthur H. Dean June 7 told Tsarapkin he hoped "henceforth the citizens of Moscow will have an equal opportunity to acquaint themselves with the proposals of each side at the UN office in Moscow," similar to the current circulation of the Western draft treaty among UN members in New York.)

RELATED DEVELOPMENT -- June 8 -- The Atomic Energy Commission said a special committee had found no evidence from the standpoint of jeopardizing any form of life to warrant calling off its proposal for an underground nuclear explosion in Alaska to create a harbor on the Northwest coast. The AEC said however, in a "First Summary Report" on 1959-60 surveys in Alaska, that it would conduct further studies before a final decision on the "Project Chariot."

LATIN AMERICA DEVELOPMENTS

Trujillo Assassination -- An investigating commission of the Organization of American States (OAS) June 7 arrived in the Dominican Republic to investigate reports of oppression as an aftermath of the May 30 assassination of Rafael L. Trujillo, the country's dictator for 31 years. Trujillo reportedly was shot in an ambush of his car by a group of assailants led by Army Gen. Juan Tomas Diaz. The State Department June 1 said "it is our earnest hope that now the people of the Dominican Republic will be able to establish those conditions which will make it possible for that country to again take its proper place within the inter-American system." (The OAS in August 1960 passed a resolution condemning the Trujillo regime. For story see 1960 Almanac p. 208) A June 1 Dominican communique announced the appointment of Rafael Trujillo Jr., the dictator's son, as head of the country's armed forces. Dominican President Joaquin Balaguer June 4 said a formula for "certifying" electoral practices throughout the Western Hemisphere might be a "basis for discussion" to bring the Republic back into the inter-American family.

Stevenson Tour -- Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, June 4 arrived in Venezuela on the first stop in a South American tour as President Kennedy's special representative. Stevenson June 8 reached Buenos Aires, Argentina, where he reportedly

was told by government officials it would be impossible to get unanimous Latin American support for action against Fidel Castro and that the U.S. should adopt a "live and let live" attitude toward Castro's Cuban regime.

Bolivia -- The government of Bolivia June 8 announced arrest of 60 members of a group they said were planning a Castro-type revolution in La Paz, and made public a manifesto signed by two Communist Party leaders which said "the glorious Cuban revolution shows it is possible to create a Socialist Republic in Latin America."

KENNEDY BACK INJURY

Press Secretary Pierre Salinger June 8 announced President Kennedy had injured his back while planting a tree during his recent visit to Canada. Salinger said the injury had no relation to a prior back injury which necessitated surgery in 1944 and 1954. Though it was not considered serious, it did cause Mr. Kennedy "constant discomfort, something like a steady toothache."

Salinger said Dr. Janet Travell described the injury as lumbo-sacral strain, a strain of the joint between the lowest lumbar vertebra and the sacrum. Salinger revealed Mr. Kennedy had used crutches while staying at Hyannis Port, Mass. prior to his European trip.

FREEDOM RIDERS

The "freedom rides" of white and Negro students and adults to test segregation practices at Southern interstate travel facilities were continuing at the week's end, with much of the activity now centered in the courts. (Weekly Report p. 879)

Following are the highlights of major developments:

May 29 -- Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy petitioned the Interstate Commerce Commission to issue regulations banning segregation in interstate bus transportation. Referring to events rising out of the freedom rides, Kennedy said, "The lack of rules has given rise to confusion on the part of motor carriers as to their duty to their passengers and has contributed, and will continue to contribute, to unrest and civil disorder."

The Commission in 1955 banned segregation of passengers in busses and trains and in railroad terminals, but did nothing about bus terminals. The Supreme Court Dec. 5, 1960 held that the Interstate Commerce Act prohibits segregation in bus terminal restaurants serving interstate passengers. (1960 Weekly Report p. 1953)

May 31 -- Alabama Gov. John Patterson proclaimed the end of martial law declared in Montgomery May 21 after a weekend of rioting over integration at the Montgomery bus terminal. The Federal District Court at Montgomery the same day opened hearings into the Federal Government's request for an injunction to restrain Montgomery and Birmingham officials and other groups, such as the Ku Klux Klan, from interfering with interstate bus travel.

June 2 -- Federal District Court Judge Frank M. Johnson Jr. issued a temporary restraining order, until June 12, against rides through Alabama organized and sponsored for the sole purpose of challenging racial barriers; charged Montgomery police with "willful failure" to head off mob riots and put the force under an injunction to keep the peace; kept in force an earlier order prohibiting the Ku Klux Klan and three individuals from further violence against the riders or other interstate bus travelers. The restraining order specifically barred the Congress of Racial Equality and some of its leaders, the Rev. Martin Luther King and his Southern Christian

Leadership Conference, the Montgomery Jail Council and the student Nashville Nonviolent Movement from bringing any more Freedom Riders into the state. The Judge said his order did not ban attacks on segregation itself as long as they were bona fide trips through Alabama without sponsorship or financial backing for that purpose.

The Justice Department announced the withdrawal of the last federal marshals from Alabama. All but 100 of the 700 originally sent there were recalled May 25.

In the meantime, Jackson, Miss., had become the target of "freedom rides" aimed at breaking racial barriers in the city's bus terminals, railroad stations, and airports. Jackson police arrested each arriving group of travelers when it refused to leave "white" dining rooms, rest rooms and waiting rooms. Between May 24 and June 8, police had taken 92 riders into custody on charges of breaching the peace.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT, TRAINING

President Kennedy June 7 sent to Congress draft legislation of a pilot program to provide employment and training opportunities for unemployed youth, including the creation of a Youth Conservation Corps. (For text of transmittal letter see p. 966) The President included a June 2 letter from Labor Secretary Arthur J. Goldberg stating that the "future outlook is extremely dark" for young untrained workers. Goldberg said the unemployment rate for the 16-20 year age group was 16.8 percent in Jan. 1961, more than twice the national average of 7.7 percent for that month.

Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey (D Minn.) and Rep. Carl D. Perkins (D Ky.) June 7 introduced the Administration bill (S 2036, HR 7536). As introduced the Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1961 established three pilot training programs: on-the-job training, local public service training, and a Youth Conservation Corps training.

On-the-job training -- The bill directed the Labor Secretary to make agreements with public and private institutions, organizations, groups and individuals to train men and women 16 to 22 years of age in skills which would enhance their employability. The bill directed the Labor

Secretary to cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare in providing vocational education to supplement on-the-job training, if necessary.

Public service training -- The Labor Secretary was directed to enlist the cooperation of state and local governments in providing training for men and women 16 to 22 years of age through employment in public agencies and facilities or in conservation, recreational or other community facilities.

Youth Conservation Corps -- The Secretary was directed to organize a Youth Conservation Corps composed of men 17 to 22 years of age and to make agreements with State and Federal conservation agencies for employment of the Corps.

Costs, financing -- The Labor Secretary was authorized to pay part of the compensation, up to \$20 per week to trainees in on-the-job or local public training projects. He was also directed to provide tools, clothing, transportation and similar items for trainees on local public training projects.

States using Youth Conservation Corps were required to pay up to half the cost of the Corps. Corps members were to receive a base compensation of \$70 per month plus up to \$20 per month for leadership services or special skills. They also were to receive quarters, subsistence, equipment, clothing and transportation. The total value of wages and benefits for Corps members was deemed to be \$200 per month for purposes of Social Security contributions.

The Labor Secretary was directed to administer the three experimental plans, provide counselling for participants, and report to the President and Congress on the progress of the program. He was also directed to establish a Youth Employment Advisory Committee, composed of 12 public members, to advise him.

The proposed legislation called for an appropriation of \$75 million for the first year, and \$100 million for each of the next two years of the three year experimental program. It was anticipated that 50,000 youths would be trained in the first year and larger numbers in the second and third years.

STATUS OF APPROPRIATIONS, 87th CONGRESS, 1st SESSION

Agency	Weekly Report Page No.	Requested	HOUSE		SENATE		Final
			Committee	Passed	Committee	Passed	
Agriculture (HR 7444)	941	\$ 6,089,244,000	\$ 5,948,566,000	\$ 5,948,466,000			
Commerce							
Defense							
District of Columbia							
Federal Payment							
District Payment							
Executive Offices							
Independent Offices (HR 7445)	942	\$ 8,625,561,000	8,424,098,000	8,404,098,000			
Interior (HR 6345)	940	782,387,000	752,319,000	753,319,000	\$ 822,649,850	\$ 813,399,850	
Labor-HEW (HR 7035)	839	4,282,148,081	4,327,457,000	4,327,457,000			
Legislative (HR 7208)	875	105,647,577	104,353,335	104,353,335			
Public Works							
State-Justice-Judiciary (HR 7371)	943	805,584,202	751,300,050	751,300,050			
Treasury-Post Office (HR 5954)	911	5,371,801,000	5,281,865,000	5,281,865,000	5,327,631,000	5,327,631,000	
Mutual Security	910						
Military Construction							
Latin America Aid (HR 6518)	910	600,000,000	600,000,000	600,000,000	600,000,000	600,000,000	\$ 600,000,000
3rd Supplemental, FY 1961 (HR 5188)	612	5,339,565,127	773,493,619	803,506,119	4,762,637,970	4,637,419,970	1,694,055,637

MAJORITY OF MEMBERS OPPOSE SUMMER RECESS

A majority of Members of Congress think Congress should remain in session each year until it finishes its work rather than adjourn for a summer recess.

Congressional Quarterly asked Members for opinions on proposals currently before Congress to recess in early summer and reconvene in the fall. Out of 537 Members polled, 294 answered.

The results showed 175 in favor of the present system and 109 for a summer recess. Ten Members made alternative suggestions.

The CQ letter asked each Congressman to indicate his preference for one of the following statements: "I think the present custom of adjourning when Congressional work is finished is satisfactory."

"I would prefer a summer recess."

Of the 175 replies favoring the present system, 83 -- 76 Representatives and 7 Senators -- were Democrats and 40 -- 34 Representatives and 6 Senators -- were Republicans. Fifty-two remained anonymous. The breakdown of the 109 Members for a summer recess: Republicans -- 27 (25 Representatives and 2 Senators); Democrats -- 39 (23 Representatives and 16 Senators); anonymous -- 43.

Comments

Thirty Members made comments on their ballots, the most frequent of which indicated their belief that Congress could easily adjourn by mid-summer each year if it planned its work more efficiently and was more diligent about its job while in session. Some thought a recess during off-election years would be valuable, but unworkable during election years. Others preferred a summer recess each year in order to enable them to vacation with their families, particularly where the children were of school age. Most of the pressure for a summer recess has come from the younger Members.

Some comments of those in favor of the present system: "This is the best system, if the session must run into the fall a recess could well be taken" then -- Rep. Joseph W. Martin Jr. (R Mass.). "Coming back after Labor Day on election years would not result in good attendance or good legislation. During those years issues should be carried to the voters at home, not debated in the Halls of Congress" -- Rep. Thomas M. Pelly (R Wash.). "GREAT GUNS! Who wouldn't prefer a nice summer recess. But WHO in the world gets elected to Congress with the idea it is an institution which can meet and adjourn simply to suit a Congressman's pleasure and preference" -- Anonymous. "I came here to work and will work 365 days per year if necessary!" -- Donald C. Bruce (R Ind.).

Comments from those supporting the recess proposals: "I quit on Aug. 1st each year" anyway -- Rep. Noah M. Mason (R Ill.). Congress' work is like "women's work -- it is never done" -- Rep. J. Ernest Wharton (R N.Y.). "I believe it would have the result of speeding up our work and completing action on necessary legislation much earlier than at present" -- Sen. John Sherman Cooper (R Ky.).

Adjournment Dates

Congress over the past 10 years has spent an average of 239.5 days in session each year, making the average date of adjournment about Aug. 30.

Congress	Year	Adjournment Date
82nd, 1st session	1951	Oct. 20
2nd session	1952	July 7
83rd, 1st session	1953	Aug. 3
2nd session	1954	Dec. 2*
84th, 1st session	1955	Aug. 2
2nd session	1956	July 27
85th, 1st session	1957	Aug. 30
2nd session	1958	Aug. 24
86th, 1st session	1959	Sept. 15
2nd session	1960	Sept. 1

*House adjourned Aug. 20.

Rep. Clem Miller (D Calif.) said neither of the alternatives represented his views and suggested earlier convening and earlier adjournment. Rep. Frances P. Bolton (R Ohio) suggested that a study group "go into all the pros and cons -- so many matters are involved."

Proposed Changes

Section 2 of the 20th Amendment to the Constitution reads: "The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 3rd day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day." Later dates have been designated in cases where Jan. 3 fell on a weekend.

The Constitution, however, set no date for the adjournment, but Congress in 1946 passed a Congressional Reorganization Act (2 USC 198) which provided: "Except in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President, the two Houses shall adjourn sine die not later than the last day in the month of July in each year unless otherwise provided by Congress." (1946 Almanac p. 362) Nevertheless, Congress normally adjourns in late July or August.

The House Rules Committee June 8 failed to act on three proposals -- H Con Res 200 and 319 by Rep. Robert R. Barry (R N.Y.) and H Con Res 206 by Rep. Richard S. Schweiker (R Pa.) -- relating to the adjournment. H Con Res 200 and 206 stipulated that Congress adjourn June 30 each year and H Con Res 319 provided for a summer recess between June 30 and the first Tuesday in October, unless reconvened at an earlier date.

In the Senate, S Con Res 6, introduced by Sen. Margaret Chase Smith (R Maine), would provide for a Congressional recess between Aug. 15 and Nov. 15 in election years and from Aug. 1 to Nov. 1 in off-election years. S Con Res 16, introduced by Sen. Gale W. McGee (D Wyo.) with 32 co-sponsors, was identical to H Con Res 319. The Senate Rules and Administration Committee as of June 8 had not scheduled hearings on these measures.

AID TO EDUCATION

COMMITTEE -- House Education and Labor.

ACTION -- June 1 reported a clean bill (HR 7300 -- H Rept 445) authorizing appropriations of \$2,484,000,000 over three years in federal funds to the states for public school construction and teachers' salaries. The bill was ordered reported May 25. (Weekly Report p. 895) The Senate May 25 passed a school-aid bill authorizing \$850 million in grants for public school operation and maintenance as well as construction and teachers' salaries. (Weekly Report p. 873)

As sent to the House floor, HR 7300:

Authorized appropriations of \$720 million in fiscal year 1962, \$828 million in fiscal 1963 and \$936 million in fiscal 1964 and provided that the funds could be used for federal grants to the states to help pay the cost of public school construction and/or public school teachers' salaries.

Based allocations to the states on the number of children of school age (5-17) and the personal income of individuals in the state per school-age child, with poorest states receiving about twice as much as the wealthiest (about 2½ times as much in the third year).

Provided that each state receive a minimum of \$12 per school-age-child.

Provided penalties, in reduction of allotments, for any state (1) whose school effort in any of the three years of the program fell below its effort in the three preceding years or (2) whose effort after fiscal 1962 fell below its effort in the three fiscal years plus the average rate increase in the national effort from 1956 through 1961. Allotments would be reduced by the amount by which the state failed to meet its effort requirements, but by no more than one-third of its allocation.

Required the states to file applications with the U.S. Office of Education indicating how the funds would be spent.

Carried a guarantee that in administering the program no federal agency or employee "shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system."

Authorized the states to use 10 cents per public school pupil, or a minimum of \$25,000 and maximum of \$150,000, in administrative expenses for the program.

Extended for three years, through June 30, 1964, PL 815 and PL 874, providing federal funds for construction and maintenance of public schools in areas "impacted" by federal activities.

Raised the authorization under PL 815 (construction) from \$40 million to \$60 million for districts with large numbers of children on tax-exempt Indian lands.

Required the Commissioner of Education to submit, by Jan. 1, 1963, a report on the operation of PL 815 and PL 874, including an analysis of the relationship between the general aid-to-education program and the impacted areas programs. (For explanation of these programs, see Weekly Report p. 859)

Made technical changes in the bases of determining rates of payment under PL 874 (operation).

The Committee said it believed "there is widespread agreement among all Americans as to the essentiality of providing first-class schools for all of our young people" and that "Americans want and need to do more." It said it recognized "the financial difficulties with which many of our states and communities are faced, and it has given heed to the legitimate fears of state and local governments that the sharply increased taxation at the local level needed to finance public education might result in industry outflow."

The report said federal aid to education would help more people gain a decent education, in order to avoid future labor hardships as a result of education, and would contribute to national defense by providing "trained citizens to keep our civilian economy progressive."

In additional views, Rep. John H. Dent (D Pa.) said the bill should include a provision for construction loans to private schools, that he had tried to convince the Committee to include such provisions, and would "make an issue in this area" when the bill came to the House floor.

In minority views, all 12 Committee Republicans said they were "unanimously and vigorously opposed to the bill as reported." They said the bill was "unsound and undesirable" because: it made no adequate provision for continuation of state effort; it would "result in an unwarranted intrusion into matters properly of local and state concern"; it would "subsidize the nation's teachers" which in turn would lead to "increasing interest in what the teachers teach."

The Republicans said the Administration had made an "unveiled excursion into legislative trickery" by including extension of PL 815 and PL 874 in the bill to sway "the votes of those who have doubts about the rest of the bill." They said the bill ignored the fact that the nation had passed the "hump" in school enrollments.

In supplemental views, Rep. Charles E. Goodell (R N.Y.) said he "emphatically" opposed HR 7300. Goodell said states and local areas were meeting the school problem effectively; federal control would result from the bill; and teachers' salaries had risen 106 percent in the past 20 years, while other salaried workers' pay had increased 91 percent.

WELFARE-PENSION PLANS

COMMITTEE -- House Education and Labor, Special Labor Subcommittee.

CONCLUDED HEARINGS -- On an Administration proposal (HR 7234-35) to amend the 1958 Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act to provide for its more effective enforcement. (Weekly Report p. 915)

TESTIMONY -- June 1 -- Walter E. Klint of the Chamber of Commerce of the U.S. opposed the bills on grounds that they gave the Secretary of Labor "unnecessary and broad regulatory authority"; infringed upon state legislation which he said was a "more appropriate and effective method of handling the problem"; unduly and unnecessarily burdened fund administration, and necessitated "an immense new agency in government" to carry out the enforcement.

Sidney Zagri of the Teamsters Union opposed the legislation and said the changes proposed were too broad and would give the Labor Secretary too much power.

June 2 -- Herbert J. Miller Jr., Justice Department assistant attorney general in charge of the Criminal Division, said his agency supported the proposed amendments. He suggested additional clarifying amendments to spell out more precisely the persons and offenses liable to criminal proceedings. He said the changes had been agreed to by the Labor Department. Miller reviewed enforcement proceedings by his Department and said some 59 cases had been referred to the agency for investigation since 1958. With two exceptions, where investigations still were in progress, prosecution had been declined and the files closed, he said. Miller said the FBI experience had been that once an inquiry was begun, a delinquent report usually was filed by the person under investigation.

Charles A. Seigfried, representing the American Life Convention, Health Insurance Assn. of America and Life Insurance Assn. of America, said these groups supported "properly designed disclosure laws", but believed the 1958 Act should not have been applicable to level-of-benefit plans (benefits guaranteed, with the employer making up the difference in any cost changes) because they were "inherently not susceptible" to abuses which prompted the legislation. He questioned whether it would not be wise to allow more time and experience under the 1958 Act before "undertaking expansions which could lead to burdensome and costly procedures." He also suggested increasing the time for filing reports on plans, "streamlining" provisions with respect to plans covering less than 100 active employees, and specifically limiting the Secretary of Labor's authority to "stated and legitimate goals."

Joseph L. Seligman Jr. of the National Small Business Men's Assn. said the 1958 Act had achieved its objective and it was unnecessary to give the Labor Secretary power to regulate and investigate pension plans.

Robert W. Bird of the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce said there was no present indication "the scope of the problem is of such paramount national significance that it requires federal crash action and federal crash dollars to cope with it."

BOXING COMMISSIONER

COMMITTEE -- Senate Judiciary, Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee.

HELD HEARINGS -- May 31, June 1-2 on a bill (S 1474) to establish an Office of National Boxing Commissioner within the Department of Justice for a five-year period. S 1474 was introduced March 29 by Subcommittee Chairman Estes Kefauver (D Tenn.).

BACKGROUND -- Kefauver Dec. 14, 1960, after the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee concluded hearings on possible conspiracy between underworld elements to maintain monopoly control over professional boxing, announced he would introduce legislation to create an Office of National Boxing Commissioner. (1960 Weekly Report p. 1988)

As introduced, major provisions of S 1474: established in the Department of Justice an Office of National Boxing Commissioner with rank and compensation equal to that of Assistant Attorney General; required all boxers, managers, promoters and matchmakers engaged in interstate bouts to obtain licenses from the Commissioner;

required that any contract entered into by a licensee of the office be filed with the Office of the Commissioner; required licensees to submit detailed financial reports concerning boxing matches in which they participated and records of financial dealings concerning interstate matches; imposed a penalty of five years imprisonment and a fine for failure to comply with the provisions of the Act; authorized the Commissioner to prosecute underworld individuals acting as managers-in-fact who had not procured a license under the Act; authorized the Commissioner to use the services of Justice Department employees (including the FBI) to carry out the provisions of the Act; established a five member Boxing Advisory Board to advise and assist the Commissioner; and terminated the Office of the Commissioner five years from the date of enactment.

TESTIMONY -- May 31 -- Rocky Marciano, former heavyweight champion, said the states had failed in attempts to supervise boxing. He said "it seems absolutely essential that a federal czar be named to head the professional sport of boxing...if it is to be kept alive." The office "should be a little FBI, with power to obtain copies of all legal documents filed with the various state boxing commissions and with the power of subpoena, enabling it to conduct regular hearings to determine whether or not there has been a violation of the statute or rules under which the czar would operate," Marciano said. He recommended that the Internal Revenue Service be empowered to hold out the tax portion of a fighter's purse after a bout so "no boxer would ever find himself in the position that our great champion Joe Louis is now in."

Gene Fullmer, National Boxing Assn. middleweight champion, said he had never dealt with the underworld but supported the bill because it would clean up whatever corruption existed and restore public confidence in professional boxing.

Tommy Loughran, light heavyweight champion from 1927-29, said the underworld element began entering professional boxing during the prohibition era and currently had "taken over absolutely." He said the Kefauver bill was "possibly the only thing that will save boxing from going on the rocks."

Harry W. Falk Jr., representing the California State Athletic Commission, said the Commission felt S 1474 would remove the underworld from boxing.

June 1 -- Rep. William Fitts Ryan (D N.Y.) supported S 1474 and said he "became familiar with the depredations of professional boxing by organized crime" as Assistant District Attorney for New York County. Ryan said Frankie Carbo, Anthony Corallo (alias Tony Ducks), James Plumeri (alias Jimmy Doyle) Johnny Dio and Tom Dio were involved in boxing rackets and "these same racketeers were prominent in investigations I conducted into labor extortion and syndicated gambling."

Joe Louis, former heavyweight champion, said state boxing officials had been under the control of the underworld. Louis said "nothing in the sports scene could be more timely than your planned corrective legislation to give the proper stature to and clean up boxing."

Melvin L. Krulwich, chairman of the New York State Athletic Commission, endorsed S 1474, but requested amendments be made to the bill so it would not bar state action.

Arthur M. Klein, a member of the Pennsylvania State Athletic Commission, endorsed the bill but requested a clearer definition of an interstate boxing bout. He

said the legislation should not replace the "authority of local commissions."

June 2 -- Abe J. Green, associate editor of the Paterson, N.J., Evening News and former president of the National Boxing Assn., said the televising of boxing matches had made it possible for "racketeers to operate on the national scene." Green said the racketeers would cut themselves in on bouts and hold them in a town far from the control of state authorities.

Jack Dempsey, former heavyweight champion, said a two step approach to boxing was required. First, he said, a cleanup was needed, followed by control of televised bouts and a pension fund for boxers. Dempsey said television caused the closing of most of the small boxing clubs and a resultant diminishing supply of boxing talent. The Government could help boxing by placing a withholding tax on boxers' purses to provide pension funds, Dempsey said.

Gene Tunney, former heavyweight champion, said the condition of boxing required a strong central and permanent agency that would not "get a lot of worthy politicians from state to state lousing this thing up."

RELATED DEVELOPMENT -- May 31 -- Frankie Carbo was convicted in Los Angeles, Calif., of extortion and conspiracy for trying to extort money from the winnings of ex-welterweight champion Don Jordan.

FARM BILL

COMMITTEE -- Senate Agriculture and Forestry.

CONCLUDED HEARINGS -- On the Administration's farm bill (S 1643). (Weekly Report p. 912) Testimony:

The Committee concluded five weeks of hearings when Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman returned for three days of questioning.

June 1 -- Committee Chairman Allen J. Ellender (D La.) said opposition to S 1643 might be lessened if the Administration agreed to amend the bill to require the Agriculture Secretary, before submitting a commodity control program to Congress, to consult with the House and Senate Agriculture Committees. Freeman replied that he would consult with the Committees as a matter of course, but had no objection to writing the procedure into the law.

Republican Committee Members said the proposed farmer advisory committees should be elected by a direct vote of producers instead of being nominated by local farmer committees and chosen by the Secretary of Agriculture as stipulated by the bill. Freeman said direct elections would be "burdensome and costly." If Congress thought he would use the advisory committees to build a personal political organization, he said, it should legally limit the size of the committees.

June 2 -- Republican Committee Members said the bill would cause Congress to surrender its legislative powers. Freeman replied that the formulation of commodity control programs would constitute administrative action taken in accordance with legislative direction. Freeman denied criticism that S 1643 gave the Agriculture Secretary authority to set wages and conditions of farm employment. Such a procedure would be "clearly illegal," he said.

June 5 -- Freeman disagreed with a contention by Sen. Bourke B. Hickenlooper (R Iowa) that the bill would greatly increase his powers. He said any Administration-proposed farm controls would be subject both to Congressional veto and rejection by farmers at referenda. Under current law, Freeman said, the Agriculture Secretary

could set price supports and conditions for eligibility for supports without submitting them to Congress or producers.

RELATED DEVELOPMENT -- The House Agriculture Committee June 6 by voice vote approved Title III of the Administration farm bill (HR 6400). Title III, approved May 17 by the Conservation and Credit Subcommittee, liberalized and expanded farm credit. (Weekly Report p. 845)

FCC REORGANIZATION PLAN

COMMITTEE -- House Government Operations.

ACTION -- June 1 reported a resolution (H Res 303 -- H Rept 446) disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 for the Federal Communications Commission. (Weekly Report p. 896)

The report said although the Committee agreed with the "desirability" of the basic objectives of the plan, and "the record demonstrates the need for action to attain them...yet, the Committee is not convinced that Reorganization Plan No. 2...could satisfactorily accomplish these objectives." The report said there was a "danger of uncertainty and confusion in the interpretation of" the plan. It said the plan would have to be implemented within the format of the 1946 Administrative Procedure Act and the 1934 Communications Act, and the possible need for legislative clarification might offset its effectiveness.

In view of these circumstances, the report said, the Committee gave added weight to the views of Rep. Oren Harris (D Ark.) chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Special Regulatory Agencies Subcommittee. The report said Harris testified during hearings on the plan that it should be rejected "in order that there might be an opportunity to amend the Communications Act in the necessary particulars by the regular legislative process."

(Harris May 25 introduced such legislation (HR 7333). The bill differed from the plan in that it provided that the Commission could rescind any previous rule it had adopted for delegation of its functions within the agency by a vote of a majority, less one, of the Commission members then holding office. The plan carried no provision for rescinding orders. HR 7333 also stipulated that the Chairman could not make assignments to other Commissioners, whereas he could do so under the plan.)

In additional views, the Reorganization Plan was supported by Democratic Committee Members John E. Moss (Calif.), Henry S. Reuss (Wis.) and Neal Smith (Iowa), and opposed by GOP Members Clare E. Hoffman (Mich.), George Meader (Mich.), Robert P. Griffin (Mich.), John B. Anderson (Ill.) and F. Bradford Morse (Mass.).

Reps. Moss and Reuss said they believed the "real issue" was that "once again the broadcasters have been challenged by a vigorous Chairman to program in the public interest or to make way for those who are willing to do so, and the broadcasters, National Assn. of Broadcasters, and their attorneys are giving battle to defeat this threat." They said "we would not be surprised if there is a long and hard fight on the bill (HR 7333) and a concentrated effort to destroy its effectiveness."

The Republicans said Reorganization Plans No. 1-4 all were contrary to Congressional intent in the Reorganization Act of 1949 that the regulatory agencies "be bipartisan, independent of and not subject to the political whims of the President."

POSTAL RATES

COMMITTEE -- House Post Office and Civil Service, CONCLUDED HEARINGS -- On HR 6418, an Administration bill to increase postal rates. (Weekly Report p. 893). Testimony:

May 23 -- Representatives of trade journal publishers opposed the proposed increases in rates for second-class mail and publications sent without subscription charge. They said Congress should establish a separate category of mail for all reduced rate and free mailings. Rate increases should be considered, they said, only if income failed to cover costs after the separation of public service mail from other mail.

Representatives of mail order businesses and direct mail advertisers opposed rate increases for third-class mail. They said higher rates would force businesses to curtail third-class mailings and would therefore not produce the anticipated revenue.

May 24 -- Representatives of libraries, book stores, book publishers, and educational institutions opposed proposed increases in non-profit second- and third-class rates and fourth-class rates on books and educational materials. They said any loss resulting from reduced rate mailings should be covered by the public service allotment. Second-class mail rates should cover a higher percentage of the cost of its handling before rate increases were imposed on mailings of non-profit organizations, they said.

June 1 -- Representatives of mail order seed and plant firms opposed HR 6418. They said the Post Office should be partially subsidized by the Government because it was a public service as well as a business.

June 6 -- Treasury Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs Robert V. Roosa said failing to raise postal rates and incurring the expected \$831 million postal deficit would be "inconsistent with sound budget and fiscal policies." He said HR 6418 should be enacted because users should pay for postal service.

Assistant Commerce Secretary Hickman Price Jr. said increased postal rates would not "unduly burden" the businesses affected. He said a Commerce Department study showed that few companies were dependent on third-class mail and that increased postal rates did not cause those companies to curtail their bulk mailings.

June 7 -- Budget Bureau Deputy Director Elmer B. Staats said the anticipated postal deficit would account for nearly a quarter of the federal budget deficit. He said HR 6418 should be enacted to "eliminate pressures on the budget" and permit increased expenditures for U.S. defenses and measures to strengthen the economy. Staats said the proposed rate increases would be equitable for the users of postal services and consistent with the Postal Policy Act of 1958 which stipulated that rates should cover costs of postal service, except public services costs which would be covered by an allocation from the public funds.

RELATED DEVELOPMENT -- June 3 -- Postmaster General J. Edward Day announced plans to increase Collection on Delivery (COD) fees Aug. 1 and to issue a 13 cent airmail stamp to replace the current 10 cent stamp used for airmail going to Central and South America. Day announced 10 cent increases in COD fee schedules up to the \$1 fee. Day estimated COD fee increases would yield about \$2,700,000 annually.

URBAN AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT

COMMITTEE -- House Government Operations, Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee,

BEGAN HEARINGS -- On an Administration bill (HR 6433) to create a Cabinet-level Urban Affairs and Housing Department. The department would take over the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and selected agencies. (For background, see Weekly Report p. 852)

TESTIMONY -- May 24 -- Budget Bureau Director David E. Bell said the new Cabinet office would not change the "existing patterns of federal-state relationships in housing and urban matters," nor change existing direct federal-municipal relationships. Few federal agencies or departments, he said, exceeded the proposed department in the "importance and magnitude of their functions." He said the HHFA spent \$4.6 billion in fiscal 1960 and ranked in expenditures behind only three other departments -- Defense, Treasury and Agriculture. The new department would provide the most effective administration of urban development programs and recognize the importance of the work of the federal housing programs, Bell said.

Mayor Richard J. Daley of Chicago said the new department was needed to coordinate federal housing programs because currently the mayor of a municipality must devote much time going "from agency to agency to get an answer to a problem or to get conflicting federal programs coordinated."

Mayor Ben West of Nashville, Tenn., representing the U.S. Conference of Mayors, said an over-all urban policy was "urgently needed." Neglect of urban areas, he said, had resulted largely from the failure to include local governments in the considerations which shaped federal urban policies.

Mayor Don Hummel of Tucson, Ariz., president of the American Municipal Assn., said the proposed department would "invigorate local governments by giving them new tools with which to attack existing problems." No amount of home rule or self-determination, he said, would make smog vanish or purify polluted streams. The solution to such problems required "federal leadership and direction," he said.

June 6 -- Rep. Wright Patman (D Texas) supported the proposal, but recommended an additional provision creating a Division for Smaller Community Development to ensure small communities "equal status, equal treatment and equal consideration with our large cities."

June 7 -- Curtis E. Huber of the National Assn. of Real Estate Boards opposed HR 6433 and said it would result in communities accepting less responsibility in the field of urban development. He said establishment of a Cabinet-level office would result in directing the Federal Housing Administration's mortgage insurance system away from the "sound underwriting principles which have characterized its operations." The proposed department would increase the fragmentation of the nation's housing effort rather than coordinate it, he said.

ELECTRICAL PRICE FIXING

COMMITTEE -- Senate Judiciary, Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee.

RESUMED HEARINGS -- On alleged price fixing and bid rigging in the electrical equipment industry. (Weekly Report p. 892) Testimony:

June 5 -- General Electric Co. President and Board Chairman Ralph J. Cordiner said he accepted his "share of responsibility" for GE's involvement in price fixing even though he "did not know of these secret violations of the law or condone such acts." Cordiner said the GE employees convicted in February 1961 had been fired, unlike the convicted employees of other electrical companies, because they had violated a written company rule. He said the firing was necessary to assure future antitrust law compliance and was not designed to make them "scapegoats" for the company.

To assure future antitrust law compliance, Cordiner said GE was currently investigating pricing practices in its motors and electronic tube divisions. He said the company had instituted a policy of requiring all division managers and department heads to certify that they understood and would comply with the company directive on antitrust laws.

June 6 -- Commerce Secretary Luther H. Hodges said large companies faced special problems in complying with antitrust laws because size increased the difficulty of communication between top management and subordinates. "Management of corporate America must assume the responsibility for a more aggressive program of acquainting its own people with its policies, its commitments, and its philosophies," Hodges said. Despite recent incidence of price fixing, he said, "industry in general and the preponderant majority of businessmen are entirely willing to assume the obligation and burden of operating properly under the most highly competitive conditions." Hodges said the newly established Business Ethics Advisory Council would try to draft "guidelines" for business conduct.

RELATED DEVELOPMENT -- June 6 -- A federal district court in Dayton, Ohio, fined four manufacturers of composition electrical resistors and two executives a total of \$101,000 for violating the antitrust laws by selling equipment to the Government at noncompetitive prices and through rigged bids.

ANTITRUST INFORMATION

COMMITTEE -- Senate Judiciary, Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee.

HELD HEARING -- June 7 on a bill (S 167) to require any corporation, or other legal entity, to provide the Attorney General at his request with documentary material pertinent to any civil antitrust investigation. The bill provided, that if the request were not fulfilled, the Attorney General could file a petition in federal district court to have it carried out.

TESTIMONY -- Assistant Attorney General for the Antitrust Division Lee Loevinger supported the proposal and said the lack of an "effective tool of investigation causes even more than a waste of time and money. It impairs the program of antitrust enforcement." He said the authority provided in S 167 would enable the Justice Department to make preliminary investigations before deciding whether or not to utilize the grand jury and thus avoid the "threat of serious delay" in such procedure.

Paul Rand Dixon, chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, said the proposal would aid the FTC by permitting it to examine documentary material taken into custody by the Justice Department.

Richard K. Decker of the American Bar Assn. supported the measure in principle, but said S 167 would "not provide the proper tools nor...adequate safeguards for the investigated company."

HIGHWAY PROGRAM

COMMITTEE -- Senate Finance.

HELD HEARINGS -- June 6 and 7 on Title II of a bill (HR 6713) changing the method of financing the federal-aid highway program. Title I of HR 6713, approved May 31 by the Senate Public Works Committee, revised the authorization schedule for the National Interstate and Defense Highway program. (Weekly Report p. 916)

Title II continued the gasoline and diesel fuel tax at 4 cents per gallon and made the following tax increases through Oct. 1, 1972: from \$1.50 to \$3.00 per 1,000 pounds on trucks weighing over 26,000 pounds when loaded; from 8 cents to 10 cents per pound on highway tires; from 9 cents to 10 cents per pound on inner tubes; and from 3 cents to 5 cents per pound on tread rubber. Title II of HR 6713 also allocated the full 10 percent excise tax on the manufacturer's price of trucks, buses and trailers to the Highway Trust Fund. (For full provisions see Weekly Report p. 755)

BACKGROUND -- President Kennedy Feb. 28 sent Congress a special highway message recommending legislation to continue the current 4-cent a gallon gasoline tax and increase the taxes on: diesel fuel from 4 cents to 7 cents per gallon; trucks over 26,000 pounds from \$1.50 to \$5 per 1,000 pounds; and on highway tires, inner tubes and tread rubber from 8, 9 and 3 cents a pound, respectively, to 10 cents each. (Weekly Report p. 351) The House May 4 passed HR 6713. (Weekly Report p. 755)

TESTIMONY -- June 6 -- Administration spokesmen recommended that the bill be amended to reinstate the President's financing proposals:

Under Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler said HR 6713 would raise \$2.5 billion less in truck taxes over the next 10 years than the amount which the Commerce Department had determined to be fair.

Deputy Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation Frank L. Barton said the trucking industry could well afford the additional taxes recommended by the President because of a "spectacular growth" indicated for the 1960s. "Certainly an industry of this size is not threatened with extinction by the addition of \$400 million a year to its operating taxes," Barton said.

Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton said it was necessary to raise the tax on tread rubber used for recapping truck tires to 10 cents per pound in order to ensure that trucks paid their fair share of highway costs.

Budget Director David E. Bell said HR 6713 made the passenger car operator pay "a disproportionate share" of the federal highway program. He said the bill "clearly would increase the budget deficit if enacted."

June 7 -- Edward V. Kiley of the American Trucking Assns. Inc. said the trucking industry was in a "desperate financial condition" and unable to pay any additional highway taxes. He said HR 6713 appeared to be the "best solution that could be worked out," but that the industry would have to be "vigorously opposed" to any increases beyond those in HR 6713.

George J. Burger of the National Federation of Independent Business said many small businesses would be seriously harmed by an increase in the tread rubber tax.

Representatives of the American Automobile Assn. said the gasoline tax should be allowed to revert to 3 cents on June 30 as scheduled and the difference made up by an increase in the diesel fuel tax and transfers from the General Fund.

FOREIGN AID

COMMITTEE -- Senate Foreign Relations.

CONTINUED HEARINGS -- On S 1983, the Administration's foreign aid bill. (Weekly Report p. 907) Testimony:

June 5 -- Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon testified on the financial aspects of the program. He said the U.S. balance-of-payments would not be adversely affected by the proposed program because foreign aid funds were spent mostly in the U.S. so that the program did not contribute substantially to foreign claims on U.S. currency. Exports financed by foreign aid funds spent in the U.S. contributed to the favorable U.S. balance of trade, he said.

Dillon said the current practice of yearly appropriations for foreign aid funds did not permit the multi-year commitments needed for adequate development planning and resulted in diminished effectiveness and increased costs of development programs. Authority to borrow from the treasury to extend long-term development loans at low or no interest rates would permit nations to become self-sustaining before requiring them to begin dollar repayment of the loans, he said. Dillon said repayment in dollars rather than in the local currency was necessary to avoid the accumulation of the borrower's currency which might cause "friction and misunderstanding in the future."

Dillon said Congress would continue to control foreign aid programs because it could curtail or terminate borrowing authority at any time. Under questioning, however, he said Congress would be "morally bound" not to change the five-year long-term borrowing authority once it was established. He said the U.S. would not be bound to abide by long-term agreements if a recipient became Communist or anti-American.

Henry R. Labouisse, International Cooperation Administration Director, said the program should be enacted because it would encourage the development of sound long-range development planning and the adoption of internal reforms and self-help measures in recipient nations. He said the proposed long-term loans financed by borrowing from the treasury were necessary to reach these goals. He said long-term U.S. commitments would encourage other industrialized nations to join in aiding underdeveloped nations. Labouisse said the new aid agency proposed in the bill was necessary to provide coordination among Executive agencies, to establish clean responsibility for projects in each geographic area of the underdeveloped world, and to reduce delays in implementing the program.

Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs George W. Ball said the program should be enacted because long-term lending authority would enable the U.S. to coordinate its economic policy for underdeveloped areas with its policy toward the industrialized world. The long-term commitments were also needed, he said, to compete with Russian aid which was extended on a long-term, low-interest rate basis.

June 6 -- Labouisse testified on the proposed development grants. He said grants would be made with "increased attention to the development of human resources and institutions" for projects considered essential by recipients willing to adopt self-help measures.

Frank M. Coffin, director of the Development Loan Fund, said the Government should be empowered to help shape an environment in which U.S. private enterprise would assist underdeveloped nations. He said U.S. firms'

foreign investments would not have a long-term adverse effect on the balance of payments because initially the investment would involve increased exports of machinery and other goods and services, and in the long run would create new markets for U.S. products. He said that while some businesses would reap large profits the risks were so high that many would not initiate investments or would withdraw them in periods of internal difficulty.

Coffin said it was necessary to ease business fears by providing U.S. Government guarantees against investment and loan losses resulting from war, insurrection, civil strife, and sanctions imposed against underdeveloped nations. He said the proposed experimental program guaranteeing against losses regardless of cause was necessary because of the extremely high risk involved in investing in certain areas. He said the Government would pay 50 percent or at most 75 percent of the loss and companies would pay an annual fee for the risk guarantee. The provision permitting the Government to assist U.S. firms' surveying investment opportunities in underdeveloped areas was needed, Coffin said, to ascertain the number and kind of economically feasible activities available for investment and development.

June 7 -- Labouisse said the aid program was designed to "insure that the aid reached the masses of the people." He also said he would attempt to recruit "men of high caliber" to fill posts in the proposed aid agency.

Coffin and Max Millikan and George Gant, members of the President's Foreign Aid Task Force, also testified in support of the bill.

HOUSE HEARINGS

The House Foreign Affairs Committee June 7 began hearings on the Administration foreign aid bill (HR 7372). Secretary of State Dean Rusk repeated essentially the same testimony he presented May 31 before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (Weekly Report p. 908). He said he felt an "added sense of urgency" about the need for an effective foreign aid program following the President's report to the nation on his meetings with world leaders in Paris, Vienna and London.

RELATED DEVELOPMENT -- President Kennedy in his June 6 report to the nation called for enactment of the Administration's foreign aid program. He said "There is no use talking against the Communist advance unless we are willing to meet our responsibilities, however burdensome they may be." (For text see p. 960)

COAL MINE SAFETY

The House Rules Committee June 7 refused to grant a rule for House action on a bill (HR 5741) to extend federal coal mine safety regulations to small mines employing 14 or less persons underground. Under existing law, such mines were exempt from federal regulations.

BACKGROUND -- HR 5741 was reported (H Rept 301) April 25 by the House Education and Labor Committee. (Weekly Report p. 761) A similar bill was passed by the Senate and reported by the House Committee in 1960, but the House did not act on it. (1960 Almanac p. 255)

The House Education and Labor Select Labor Subcommittee Feb. 21 and 28, 1961 held hearings on proposals to extend the safety requirements and March 9 approved HR 5741 and sent it to the full Committee.



CURRENT DISTRICTS

DISTRICT NUMBER	INCUMBENT	POPULATION*
1	William C. Cramer (R)	820,443
2	Charles E. Bennett (D)	474,946
3	Robert L.F. Sikes (D)	563,646
4	Dante B. Fascell (D)	982,968
5	A. Sydney Herlong (D)	739,006
6	Paul G. Rogers (D)	743,966
7	James A. Haley (D)	386,593
8	D.R. (Billy) Matthews (D)	239,992

STATE AVERAGE

618,945

NEW DISTRICTS

DISTRICT NUMBER	RESIDENT INCUMBENT	POPULATION*	VARIATION FROM AVERAGE	1960 CONGRESS VOTE† Dem. GOP
1	Sikes (D)	379,288	- 8.1%	100% --
2	Bennett (D)	455,411	+ 10.4	82.6 17.4%
3		500,000	+ 21.2	70.5 29.5
4	Fascell (D)	482,968	+ 17.0	
5	Herlong (D)	377,421	- 8.5	89.1 10.9
6	Rogers (D)	660,345	+ 60.1	61.8 38.2
7	Haley (D)	405,611	- 1.7	61.6 38.4
8	Matthews (D)	241,250	-41.5	98.0 2.0
9		237,235	-42.5	100 --
10		397,788	- 3.6	57.1 42.9
11		439,578	+ 6.5	90.5 9.5
12	Cramer (R)	374,655	- 9.1	30.4 69.6

NEW STATE AVERAGE

412,630

*Based on final official 1960 census figures.

†Based on the official vote received by major party Congressional candidates within the area of the proposed new districts.

The Florida House June 2 gave final approval 54-34 to a compromise Congressional redistricting plan. The House action, taken one hour before final adjournment, redrew the state's Congressional districts to allow for an increase in U.S. Representatives from 8 to 12 beginning in 1963. The redistricting bill received final Senate passage June 1. Gov. C. Farris Bryant (D) was expected to sign the bill.

Florida's gain of four new House seats came as a result of a population increase between 1950 and 1960 of 2,180,255, or 78.7 percent over the 1950 figure of 2,771,305. The 1960 population according to Census Bureau figures was 4,951,560.

The redistricting plan finally adopted by the Democratic-controlled Legislature was a product of a joint

House-Senate conference committee after each chamber had passed differing bills.

Florida observers said the creators of the redistricting bill appeared to have as their purpose the formation of new Congressional districts in which state Democratic political figures could win election to the U.S. House of Representatives, while assuring the re-election of incumbent Representatives.

The earlier House version, passed May 15, was similar to the final bill in that it put the districts with the heaviest population in southern Florida, while districts in the northern rural part of the state had considerably less population. The population spread among the districts in the first House version went from a high of approximately 578,000 (6th District), to a low of 241,000 (9th District). The final version of the bill creates a spread from a high of 660,345 (6th District) to a low of 237,235 (9th District). (See chart and map above)

The Senate May 23 passed its version of the redistricting plan, which made a number of changes in the first House bill. The Senate version switched some counties in the southern districts but made no allowance for the population spread between northern and southern districts. The population figures in the Senate version ranged from approximately 577,000 (6th District) to 241,000 (9th District).

The differing bills were then sent to the joint conference committee headed by state Sen. John Rawls (Jackson County) who is regarded as the leading prospective candidate for the new 9th District House seat.

Gov. Bryant May 25 said he would submit a proposal to the conference committee which would include reshuffling of the small north Florida districts and would be "more representative" from the population standpoint. Before Senate passage of the compromise measure, Gov. Bryant June 1 said he had "suggested modifications in line with my plan. Not all of them were accepted." He said, however, that the outcome would "be better than in 1951," when the last Congressional redistricting took place.

State Rep. Welborn Daniel (Lake County) June 2 said population was only one of a number of factors considered in creating the compromise redistricting bill. "Other factors include affinity of interest and the number of governmental units such as county commissions and the number of cities with which the Congressman has to deal," he said. "The philosophy never has been that population is the only factor."

State Rep. E.S. Roberts (Palm Beach County) June 2 said the 6th District with a population of 660,345 was "grossly unfair" when two North Florida districts had a combined population of less than that. He said Palm Beach and Broward Counties were two of the state's fastest growing counties and within a few years would have more than one million people.

U.S. Rep. Paul G. Rogers (D), who will probably be the incumbent in the new 6th District, June 5 said "the new boundaries drawn by the state Legislature do not reflect the real growth of our area nor provide us with the additional representation this growth should receive."

U.S. Rep. William C. Cramer (R 1st Dist.), who will probably be the incumbent in the new 12th District, June 5 said the redistricting bill was a "typical gerrymandering job," and predicted that, despite Democratic efforts to the contrary, the Republicans would in the future elect "two or three" more Representatives. He said "the Legislature completely ignored the basic ground rules of proportional representation."

Political Line-Up

The net effect of the redistricting bill will be to add three safe Democratic Districts (3rd, 9th and 10th), one Doubtful Democratic District (11th) and solidify the GOP hold on the 12th District.

The 11th District will be rated Doubtful Democratic because the populous Orange and Brevard Counties, which have growing Republican strength, will not be completely offset by Indian River and St. Lucie Counties. The 1960 Congress vote in the new 11th District does not reflect the true Republican strength since the 1960 GOP candidate in the 5th District, where Brevard and St. Lucie are presently located, died before the Nov. 8 election leaving Rep. A. Sydney Herlong (D) unopposed. In the 1960 election, Democratic Gov. Bryant lost the counties composing the new 11th District with 47.6 percent of the vote, while President John F. Kennedy received only 33.7 percent.

The 12th District will be rated Safe Republican. The 6th and 7th Districts will be rated Leaning Democratic and the 1st through 5th, and 8th through 10th Districts will be rated Safe Democratic.

District Characteristics

The 1st District (Northwest) has chemical, paper and nylon manufacturing centered around Pensacola. Commercial fishing is important along the Gulf coast. The principal agricultural activities are corn, cotton and peanut farming. Tyndall and Eglin Air Force Bases and the Pensacola Naval Air Station are within the District. Panama City and Pensacola are the main urban centers.

The 2nd District (Northeast) is mostly composed of the Jacksonville metropolitan area. Jacksonville's principal industries include tobacco preparation, insurance and port operations. The population of the city is approximately 40 percent Negro. Jacksonville Naval Air Station and Mayport Naval Base are included in the District.

The 3rd District (northern portion of Dade County) includes part of the city of Miami, Miami Beach and Hialeah. Miami Beach is a relatively wealthy resort area with some high income residential areas. A large aluminum fabrication industry is centered around Hialeah. Northwest Miami includes some low-middle income residential areas. The District is considered to be one of the most rapidly growing in the state.

The 4th District (southern portion of Dade County, Florida keys) includes the main business district of Miami and middle to high income residential areas. In the Southern part of Dade County there is an important winter vegetable farming center. The Western part of the District is mostly swampland. Key West has a Naval Base, while the keys are a rapidly growing resort area with a significant commercial fishing industry. Homestead Air Force Base is in the District.

The 5th District (Central) has a large number of lakes and pine forests. Cattle grazing and citrus growing are the principal agricultural pursuits. Phosphate mining is important in Marion County. Daytona Beach is the principal city.

The 6th District (South Central) is the largest District in population and the fastest growing in the state. Important industries include building construction, aircraft manufacturing, electronics and some oil wells in Collier County. Truck farming, sugar cane and flower growing and cattle grazing are the main agricultural pursuits, with some citrus growing. The central part of the

District is mainly Everglades swamps. West Palm Beach, Ft. Lauderdale and Ft. Myers are the main cities.

The 7th District (West Central) is principally agricultural with citrus growing and a large cattle grazing industry being the most important. Phosphate mining is particularly important in Polk County. There is some light industry including electronics around Sarasota. The principal cities are Lakeland and Sarasota.

The 8th District (Northeast) is generally agricultural with tobacco and peanut growing the most important activities. There are a number of pine forests scattered throughout the District. Baker County has a portion of the Okefenokee Swamp. Gainesville is the principal city and seat of the University of Florida.

The 9th District (North) is mainly agricultural with tobacco, corn, peanuts and cotton the principal products. Pine forests are scattered throughout the District. There is a commercial fishing industry along the coast. Tallahassee, the principal city, is the state capital and home of Florida State University.

The 10th District (West Central) is mostly the Tampa metropolitan area. Tobacco preparation, ship-building and port operations, meat packing and phosphate processing are the main industries. Organized labor is politically active in the district. In the eastern part of the county there is some citrus growing and cattle grazing. There is a large Latin American population in and around Tampa.

The 11th District (East Central) includes the Cape Canaveral missile launching complex and large missile component factory at Orlando, the principal city. Citrus growing is the principal agricultural pursuit, with some cattle grazing and truck farming. Along the coastal resort areas sport fishing is one of the main activities. There are also a number of canneries and food preparation plants in the District.

The 12th District (West Central) is composed of the St. Petersburg and Clearwater metropolitan areas. There are some light industries in the District, such as electronics. Tourism is economically important to the area. The District has a relatively large proportion of older retired persons.



Political Notes

NIXON SPEECHES

Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, speaking to a \$100-a-plate GOP fund raising dinner in Los Angeles, June 1 said that "as a result of the policies the Administration has followed in Laos and Cuba, Mr. Khrushchev may have gained an entirely false impression with regard to the firm determination of the American people to resist Communism's aggressive moves toward world domination." Nixon said "any miscalculation he might have in this respect must be removed." "What is critically important now is that at the earliest possible time we make a final effort" to get an enforceable atomic tests suspension agreement.

Nixon said the recent Congressional redistricting plan for California was "a cheap, ward-healing political power play -- the latest of a series of inept and bungling actions which have reduced Governor Brown's prestige to a new low." (For details of the redistricting plan see Weekly Report p. 930)

At a June 6 Republican \$50-a-plate dinner in Anaheim, Calif., Nixon said President Kennedy "has said Americans must sacrifice. He asks more for defense. But he has sent message after message to Congress on what the Government will do for the people." Nixon said President Kennedy has proposed \$4 billion for defense and \$11 billion for domestic spending and welfare programs, "none essential to national security." "A compulsory health program for persons over 65...would mean a program which would put the medical profession under federal control," Nixon said. Regarding federal aid to school teachers, Nixon said he did not want "to see the Federal Government get the right to tell teachers what to teach by getting the power to pay them."

Nixon said President Kennedy can best express America's determination to Soviet Premier Khrushchev by saying "we're going to spend every dollar necessary for defense, but we're going to cut non-defense spending down to essentials." He said the recent meeting between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev "serves a useful purpose," but he said he "was glad no 'Spirit of Vienna'" came out of the meeting "which might create a sense of complacency."

KILDAY APPOINTMENT

President John F. Kennedy June 1 from Paris announced his intention to appoint Rep. Paul J. Kilday (D Texas, 20th Dist.) to the Court of Military Appeals. President Kennedy said the appointment would be made at the end of the current session of Congress.

Kilday June 1 said he would accept the appointment when offered and would resign from the House in time for a successor to be chosen in a special election before the beginning of the second session of Congress in January 1960. Kilday has served in the House since 1939 and is the second ranking Democrat on the House Armed Services Committee. His District comprises the city of San Antonio.

Leading prospective Democratic candidates for Kilday's seat are state Sens. Maury Maverick Jr. and Henry B. Gonzales, who ran fifth and sixth respectively in the April 4 special Senate election. (Weekly Report p. 813) Both men are considered liberals.

Texas Republicans, inspired by John G. Tower's victory in the May 27 Senate run-off election, have announced they will run a candidate for the House seat for the first time in recent years. (Weekly Report p. 934) Leading prospective GOP candidates are Harry Catto Jr., San Antonio business man and the son-in-law of former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Oveta Culp Hobby, and John Goode Jr., former Bexar County Republican chairman.

COAD TO RETIRE

Rep. Merwin Coad (D Iowa) June 8 announced that he would not be a candidate for any public office in 1962. He did not give a reason for his decision.

His 6th Congressional District was carved up by the Congressional redistricting bill passed May 3 by the Republican-controlled Iowa Legislature. (Weekly Report p. 855)

He has served in the House since 1957, and is a member of the House Agriculture Committee.

AGED HEALTH CARE

Members of the Group Health Assn. of America, Inc., at their annual meeting in Portland, Ore., May 10 reaffirmed the Assn.'s support "for immediate Congressional action to provide health benefits for the aged, financed through the Old Age Survivors Disability Insurance system...." The Assn. also adopted a resolution calling for immediate action on three Kennedy Administration legislative proposals: S 1072 and HR 4999 providing \$75 million annually over a 10-year-period for matching construction grants for new medical, dental, osteopathic and public health facilities, federal grants to medical schools for award to talented students on a need basis, and increased public research facility construction (Weekly Report p. 789); S 1071 and HR 4998 providing \$20 million for matching grants to states for the construction of nursing homes, and the removal of the \$30 million ceiling on appropriations in the Public Health Service Act (Weekly Report p. 350); and S 1158 and HR 5887 assisting voluntary nonprofit associations offering prepaid health service programs to secure necessary facilities and equipment through long-term, interest-bearing loans.

TRUTH IN LENDING

Carl A. Bimson, president of the American Bankers Assn. told the Minnesota Bankers Assn. on June 6, that the bankers of America favor full disclosure of financing charges but oppose the "truth-in-lending" bill (HR 6725) introduced May 1 by Rep. Abraham J. Multer (D N.Y.).

Bimson said the language of the bill, requiring the disclosure of finance charges in the extension of credit, "hides a hoax, because the bill as it is written cannot be enforced without also setting up and using vast new federal powers to change the whole pattern of our present system of using credit in retail distribution." Hearings were held in 1960 on a similar bill (S 2755) introduced by Sen. Paul H. Douglas (D Ill.). (1960 Almanac p. 75)

Lobbyist Registrations

Thirty-five new registrations filed under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act were made public May 5 1961-May 26, 1961. (For earlier registrations, see Weekly Report p. 817)

Registrations are listed by category (with employers listed alphabetically): Business, Citizens, Farm, Foreign Individuals, Labor, Military and Veterans, and Professional. Where certain information is not listed (such as legislative interest or compensation), the information was not filed by the registrant.

Business Groups

● EMPLOYER AND REGISTRANT -- AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR TECHNICAL PRODUCTS, P.O. Box 9827, Washington 15, D.C. Filed 5/15/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Registration in anticipation of bills or investigation for denial of petition before the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization for the restriction on importation of military rifles."

2. Registrant -- STEUART L. PITTMAN, 910 17th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. Filed 5/15/61.

3. Registrant -- RICHARD BREED, 10 Prince St., Alexandria, Va. Filed 5/15/61.

● EMPLOYER -- American Gas Assn., 420 Lexington Ave., New York 17, N.Y.

Registrant -- HAROLD S. WALKER Jr., 420 Lexington Ave., New York 17, N.Y. Filed 4/25/61.

Legislative Interest -- "On behalf of American Gas Assn. to be generally acquainted with the course and content of legislation in Congress which may affect the interests of member companies."

Previous Registrations -- Walker was the third individual to register in the employ of the American Gas Assn. since 1959.

● EMPLOYER -- American Hotel Assn., 777 14th St. N.W., Washington 5, D.C.

Registrant -- ALBERT L. McDERMOTT, 743 Washington Bldg., Washington, D.C. Filed 5/8/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Legislation of interest to the Assn. in the labor-management area."

Compensation -- \$200 quarterly.

Expenses -- \$25 quarterly.

Previous Registrations -- McDermott was the ninth individual to register in the employ of the American Hotel Assn. since 1948.

● EMPLOYER -- American Paper and Pulp Assn., 122 E. 42nd St., New York 17, N.Y.

Registrant -- JAMES E. JONES, 122 E. 42nd St., New York 17, N.Y. Filed 5/2/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Legislative interests are those of employer."

Previous Registrations -- Jones was the sixth individual to register in the employ of the American Paper and Pulp Assn. since 1950.

● EMPLOYER -- Ashland Oil and Refining Co., Ashland, Ky.

Registrant -- GINSBURG, LEVENTHAL, BROWN & MORRISON, a law firm, 1632 K St. N.W., Washington, D.C. Filed 5/18/61.

Legislative Interest -- "In opposition to HR 2963 (a bill to establish an Inland Navigation Commission and authorize the collection of fair and reasonable charges for use of inland waterway navigational improvements constructed with federal funds)."

Compensation -- \$10,000 yearly.

Previous Registrations -- Society to Study Private Property Interests in Foreign Countries (1955 Almanac, p. 701); North German Lloyd, Bremen, Germany (1957 Almanac, p. 761).

● EMPLOYER -- Assn. of American Railroads, Transportation Bldg., Washington, D.C.

Registrant -- TOM PICKETT, 944 Transportation Bldg., Washington, D.C. Filed 5/1/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Support pending or proposed legislation in the interest of a sound national transportation policy."

Previous Registrations -- Pickett was the sixteenth individual to register in the employ of the Assn. of American Railroads since 1946.

● EMPLOYER AND REGISTRANT -- CALIFORNIA WINE INSTITUTE, 717 Market St., San Francisco, Calif.

2. Registrant -- ARNOLD FORTAS & PORTER, 1229 19th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. Filed 5/15/61.

Legislative Interest -- "To oppose S 1247, a bill to clarify the application of the anti-trust laws to certain contracts and agreements entered into by state alcoholic beverage agencies with suppliers of alcoholic beverages."

Previous Registrations -- See Weekly Report p. 817.

● EMPLOYER -- Chrysler Corp., 341 Mass. Ave., Detroit 33, Mich.

Registrant -- WALTER A. EDWARDS, 1700 K St. N.W., Washington 6, D.C. Filed 5/10/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Interest of a general nature in any legislation affecting employer's business."

Previous Registration -- Edwards was the second individual to register in the employ of Chrysler Corp., since 1955.

● EMPLOYER -- District of Columbia Transit System, 36th and M St., Washington, D.C.

Registrant -- DONALD S. DAWSON, 731 Transportation Bldg., Washington, D.C. Filed 5/12/61.

Legislative Interest -- "HR 6634, a bill to amend the Act of August 9, 1955, relating to the regulation of fares for the transportation of school children in the District of Columbia."

Previous Registrations -- Motor Carriers Leasing Conference (1954 Almanac p. 686); Schenley Distillers (1955 Almanac p. 694); Hilton Hotels (1956 Almanac p. 678, 1959 Almanac p. 695); C.I.T. Finance Corporation, National Consumers Life (1959 Almanac p. 693, 698); American Industrial Bankers Assn. (1960 Almanac p. 680).

Dawson was the third individual to register in the employ of D.C. Transit System since 1960.

● EMPLOYER -- Equitable Life Insurance Company, 3900 Wisconsin Ave., Washington, D.C.

Registrant -- DAWSON, GRIFFIN, PICKENS AND RIDDELL, 731 Transportation Bldg., Washington, D.C. Filed 5/19/61.

Legislative Interest -- "HR 7044 - a bill to amend Section 35 of Chapter III of the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia."

Previous Registrations -- See Weekly Report p. 547.

● EMPLOYER AND REGISTRANT -- LINEN SUPPLY INSTITUTE OF GREATER WASHINGTON, 2400 16th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. Filed 5/2/61.

Expenses -- \$2,600 yearly.

● EMPLOYER -- National Assn. of Chain Drug Stores, 34th and Park Ave., New York, N.Y.

Registrant -- EX-SEN, SCOTT W. LUCAS (D Ill., 1939-1951), 1025 Conn. Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. Filed 4/28/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Legislation to repeal the retailers excise tax on toilet preparations."

Compensation -- \$1,000 quarterly.

Expenses -- \$100 quarterly.

Previous Registrations -- E.J. Albrecht Co. (1955 Almanac p. 683); Bicycle Manufacturing Assn. of America, Republic of Panama and State Loan & Finance Corp. (1956 Almanac p. 669, 686, 678); Roadside Business Assn., Emmco Insurance Co., Marian and Arthur Sachs, the American Trucking Assns. Inc., Western Medical Corp., Republic of Panama, Joseph E. Seagram & Sons Inc. (1957 Almanac p. 754, 746, 765, 754, 756, 761, 755); World Commerce Corp. (1958 Almanac p. 647); Outdoor Advertising Assn. of America, Roadside Business Assn., Western National Life Insurance Co. of Texas, St. James Lumber Co., Pinewood Acres and Gaylord Inc. (1959 Almanac p. 699, 700, 703, 695).

The law firm of Lucas & Thomas registered for American Finance Conference, Radar-Radio Industries of Chicago, Brunswick-Balke-Collender Co., Trailer Coach Manufacturers Assn. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co. (1951 Almanac p. 696, 697, 701, 705); National Assn. of Retail Druggists (1952 Almanac p. 441); American Finance Conference, Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Adolph von Zedlitz (1953 Almanac p. 582); Revere Copper and Brass, Mobile Homes and Manufacturers Assn. (1954 Almanac p. 686, 691); Cook Electric Co. (1955 Almanac p. 687).

Lucas was the third individual to register in the employ of the National Assn. of Chain Drug Stores since 1948.

● EMPLOYER -- National Assn. of Home Builders of the U.S., 1625 L St. N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

* Registrant -- JOHN J. RILEY, 1625 L St. N.W., Washington 6, D.C. Filed 5/2/61.

2. Registrant -- HENRY M. SHINE Jr., 1625 L St. N.W., Washington 6, D.C. Filed 5/2/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Interested in labor legislation affecting the construction industry."

Previous Registrations -- Riley and Shine were the eighth and ninth individuals to register in the employ of the National Assn. of Home Builders of the U.S. since 1947.

● EMPLOYER -- National Lumber Manufacturers Assn., 1319 18th St. N.W., Washington, D.C.

Registrant -- DONALD BALDWIN, 1319 18th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. Filed 4/27/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Legislation directly or indirectly affecting the interests of the lumber manufacturing industry."

Previous Registration -- Baldwin was the ninth individual to register in the employ of the National Lumber Manufacturers Assn. since 1946.

● EMPLOYER -- New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall St., New York 5, N.Y.

Registrant -- ALGER B. CHAPMAN, 11 Wall St., New York 5, N.Y. Filed 4/28/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Proposed legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members."

Previous Registrations -- Chapman was the seventh individual to register in the employ of the New York Stock Exchange since 1947.

● EMPLOYER -- North Carolina Railroad Assn., Box 2635, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Registrant -- J. C. B. EHRINGHAUS, Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C. Filed 5/17/61.

Legislative Interest -- "All legislation affecting the railroad industry."

● EMPLOYER -- The Philip Carey Manufacturing Co., Lockland, Cincinnati 15, Ohio.

Registrant -- DONALD C. ALEXANDER, 603 Dixie Terminal Bldg., Cincinnati 2, Ohio. Filed 5/18/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Against proposed U.S. taxation of foreign business corporations."

● EMPLOYER AND REGISTRANT -- RECORD INDUSTRY ASSN. OF AMERICA INC., 1 East 57th St., New York 22, N.Y. Filed 5/8/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Urging enactment of HR 6345, a bill to provide criminal penalties for the counterfeiting of phonograph records, and in any legislation affecting the phonograph industry."

2. Registrant -- FRED LIVINGSTON, 802 Ring Bldg., Washington 6, D.C. Filed 5/1/61.

3. Registrant -- JOSEPH BORKIN, 802 Ring Bld., Washington 6, D.C. Filed 5/1/61.

Previous Registrations -- Livingston has registered for the following firms: Air Freight Forwarders Assn. and the Alleghany Corp. (1960 Almanac p. 667). Borkin has registered for the following firms: American-Indonesian Corp., National Independent Air Carriers (1949 Almanac p. 859, 848); Wabash Appliance Corp., Jewel Products Corp., Duro Test Corp., Republic Co., Solar Electric Co., Pennsylvania Illuminating Co., Elram Lamp Works, Carlton Lamp Co., Dura Electric Co., Save Electric Co. (1950 Almanac p. 777, 778); Alleghany Corp. (1959 Almanac p. 690).

Livingston and Borkin were the third and fourth individuals to register in the employ of the Record Industry Assn. of America Inc. since 1952.

Citizen Groups

● EMPLOYER -- National Anti-Vivisection Society, 100 E. Ohio St., Chicago 11, Ill.

Registrant -- GEORGE E. FLATHER Jr., Colorado Bldg., Washington, D.C. Filed 4/24/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Against HR 1937 and HR 3556" (bills relating to the humane treatment of animals used in experiments and tests by recipients of grants from the U.S. and by agencies and instrumentalities of the U.S. government).

Individuals

● EMPLOYER AND REGISTRANT -- A. ARTHUR GARDNER, 1630 Jefferson Place, Hollywood, Fla. Filed 5/10/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Will be interested in legislation affecting the majority."

● EMPLOYER AND REGISTRANT -- KENNETH C. HENDRICKS, 7303 Norfolk Ave., Bethesda 14, Md. Filed 4/28/61.

● EMPLOYER AND REGISTRANT -- RUFUS KING, South-ern Bldg., Washington 5, D.C. Filed 5/8/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Legislation affecting the taxation and regulation of coin operated devices."

Labor Groups

● EMPLOYER AND REGISTRANT -- AMERICAN FEDERATION OF MUSICIANS (AFL-CIO), 425 Park Ave., New York 22, N.Y. Filed 5/1/61.

2. Registrant -- HAL LEYSOHN, 122 E. 42nd St., New York 22, N.Y. Filed 4/26/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Repeal of 'cabaret excise tax'. Support of various 'arts' legislation in behalf of music."

Compensation -- \$1,000 monthly.

Expenses -- \$2,500 monthly.

Previous Registrations -- Leysohn registered for the same group in 1956 (1956 Almanac p. 689) and 1959 (1959 Almanac p. 710).

* EMPLOYER AND REGISTRANT -- INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, CHAUFFEURS, WAREHOUSEMEN & HELPERS OF AMERICA, 25 Louisiana Ave. N.W., Washington 1, D.C. Filed 4/12/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Interested in legislation affecting labor unions and the general welfare of the membership."

● EMPLOYER AND REGISTRANT -- MARITIME TRADES DEPARTMENT (AFL-CIO), 815 16th St. N.W., Washington 6, D.C. Filed 5/5/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Legislation affecting the interests of the working people."

● EMPLOYER -- National Postal Union, 509 14th St. N.W., Washington, D.C.

Registrant -- WALTER NOREEN, 509 14th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. Filed 5/1/61.

Legislative Interest -- "All bills dealing with Federal and/or Postal employees."

● EMPLOYER -- Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union (AFL-CIO), 132 W. 43rd St., New York 36, N.Y.

Registrant -- ELIZABETH HAWES DAVIS, 815 16th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. Filed 4/27/61.

Legislative Interest -- "All legislation affecting welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting retail workers."

Previous Registrations -- Davis was the third individual to register in the employ of the Retail Workers Union since 1947.

Professional Groups

● EMPLOYER -- American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, 575 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y.

Registrant -- CHARLES H. BROWN, 1028 Conn. Ave., Washington 6, D.C. Filed 5/22/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Amendments to copyright laws."

Compensation -- \$480 monthly.

Expenses -- \$320 monthly.

Previous Registrations -- Brown was the fifth individual to register in the employ of the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers since 1951.

● EMPLOYER -- National Education Assn., 1201 16th St. N.W., Washington, D.C.

Registrant -- CHARLES H. BROWN, 1028 Conn. Ave., Washington 6, D.C. Filed 5/22/61.

Legislative Interest -- "Education legislation."

Compensation -- \$400 monthly.

Expenses -- \$200 monthly.

Previous Registrations -- Brown was the twentieth individual to register in the employ of the National Education Assn. since 1947.



Presidential Report

TEXT OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S JUNE 6 REPORT TO NATION

Following is the complete text of President Kennedy's June 6 radio and television report to the nation on his European trip: (See p. 944)

I returned this morning from a week-long trip to Europe and I want to report to you on that trip in full.

It was in every sense an unforgettable experience. The people of Paris, of Vienna, of London were generous in their greeting. They were heartwarming in their hospitality. And their graciousness to my wife is particularly appreciated.

We knew, of course, the crowds, and the shouts, were meant in large measure for the country that we represented, which is regarded as the chief defender of freedom.

Equally memorable was the pageantry of European history and their culture that is very much a part of any ceremonial reception.

To lay a wreath at the Arc de Triomphe, to dine at Versailles and Schoenbrunn Palace and with the Queen of England, these are the colorful memories that will remain with us for many years to come.

Each of the three cities that we visited -- Paris, Vienna and London -- have existed for many centuries and each serves as a reminder that the Western civilization that we seek to preserve has flowered over many years and has defended itself over many centuries.

But this was not a ceremonial trip.

GOALS OF UNITY, PEACE

Two aims of American foreign policy above all others were the reason for the trip -- the unity of the free world, whose strength is the security of us all, and the eventual achievement of a lasting peace. My trip was devoted to the advancement of these two aims.

To strengthen the unity of the West, our journey opened in Paris and closed in London. My talks with General de Gaulle were profoundly encouraging to me. Certain differences in our attitude on one or another problem became insignificant in view of our common commitment to defend freedom.

Our alliance, I believe, became more secure. The friendship of our nation, I hope, with theirs became firmer. And the relations between the two of us who bear responsibility became closer and I hope were marked by confidence.

I found General de Gaulle far more interested in our frankly stating our position whether or not it was his own than in appearing to agree with him when we do not.

But he knows full well the true meaning of an alliance. He is, after all, the only major leader of World War II who still occupies a position of great responsibility. His life has been one of unusual dedication. He is a man of extraordinary personal character, symbolizing the new strength and the historic grandeur of France.

FRENCH MEETING 'VALUABLE'

Throughout our discussions, he took the long view of France and the world at large.

I found him a wise counselor for the future and an informative guide to the history that he has helped to make.

Thus we had a valuable meeting. I believe that certain doubts and suspicions were removed on both sides. Problems which proved to be not of substance but of wording or procedure were cleared away.

No question, however sensitive, was avoided. No area of interest was ignored. And the conclusions that we reached will be important for the future.

In our agreement on defending Berlin; on working to improve the defenses of Europe; on aiding the economic and political independence of the underdeveloped world, including Latin America; on spurring European economic unity; on concluding successfully the conference at Laos, and on closer consultations and solidarity in the Western alliance, General de Gaulle could not have been more cordial. And I could not have more confidence in any man.

In addition to his individual strength of character, the French people as a whole showed vitality and energy which were both impressive and gratifying.

Their recovery from the post-war period is dramatic. Their productivity is increasing, and they are steadily building their stature in both Europe and Africa.

And thus I left Paris for Vienna with increased confidence in Western unity and strength.

The people of Vienna know what it is to live under occupation and they know what it is to live in freedom. Their welcome to me as President of this country should be heartwarming to us all.

'SOBER' TALKS WITH KHRUSHCHEV

I went to Vienna to meet the leader of the Soviet Union, Mr. Khrushchev. For two days we met in sober, intensive conversation. And I believe it is my obligation to the people, to the Congress and to our Allies to report on those conversations candidly and publicly.

Mr. Khrushchev and I had a very full and frank exchange of views on the major issues that now divide our two countries.

I will tell you now that it was a very sober two days. There was no discourtesy, no loss of tempers, no threats or ultimatums by either side. No advantage or concession was either gained or given. No major decision was either planned or taken. No spectacular progress was either achieved or pretended.

This kind of informal exchange may not be as exciting as a full-fledged summit meeting with a fixed agenda and a large corps of advisers where negotiations are attempted and new agreements sought.

But this was not intended to be and was not such a meeting, nor did we plan any future summit meetings at Vienna.

But I found this meeting, sober as it was, to be immensely useful.

I had read his speeches of his policies. I had been advised on his views. I had been told by other leaders of the West -- General de Gaulle, Chancellor Adenauer, Prime Minister Macmillan -- what manner of man he was.

But I bear the responsibility of the Presidency of the United States and it is my duty to make decisions that no adviser and no ally can make for me.

It is my obligation and responsibility to see that these decisions are as informed as possible; that they are based upon as much direct, first-hand knowledge as possible.

I therefore thought it was of immense importance that I know Mr. Khrushchev, that I gain as much insight and understanding as I could on his present and future policies.

At the same time I wanted to make certain Mr. Khrushchev knew this country and its policies; that he understood our strength and our determination, and that he knew that we desired peace with all nations of every kind.

I wanted to present our views to him directly, precisely, realistically, and with an opportunity for discussion and clarification.

This was done.

No new aims were stated in private that have not been stated in public on either side. The gap between us was not, in such a short period, materially reduced, but at least the channels of communication were opened more fully.

SEE PERIL LESSENER

At least the chances of a dangerous misjudgment on either side should now be less, and at least the men on whose decisions the peace, in part, depends have agreed to remain in contact.

This is important, for neither of us tried to merely please the other, to agree merely to be agreeable, to say what the other wanted to hear.

And just as our judicial system relies on witnesses appearing in court and on cross-examination instead of hearsay testimony or

affidavits on paper, so, too, was this direct give-and-take of immeasurable value in making clear and precise what we considered to be vital.

For the facts of the matter are that the Soviets and ourselves give wholly different meanings to the same words: war, peace, democracy and popular will. We have wholly different views of right and wrong, of what is an internal affair and what is aggression. And above all, we have wholly different concepts of where the world is and where it is going.

Only by such a discussion was it possible for me to be sure that Mr. Khrushchev knew how differently we view the present and the future. Our views contrasted sharply, but at least we knew better at the end where we both stood.

Neither of us was there to dictate a settlement or to convert the other to a cause or to concede our basic interests. But both of us were there, I think, because we realized that each nation has the power to inflict enormous damage upon the other, that such a war could and should be avoided, if at all possible, since it would settle no dispute and prove no doctrine, and that care should thus be taken to prevent our conflicting interests from so directly confronting each other that war necessarily ensued.

We believe in a system of national freedom and independence. He believes in an expanding and dynamic concept of world communism.

And the question was whether these two systems can ever hope to live in peace without permitting any loss of security or any denial of the freedom of our friends.

However difficult it may seem to answer this question in the affirmative as we approach so many harsh tests, I think we owe it to all mankind to make every possible effort.

That is why I consider the Vienna talks to be useful. The somber mood that they conveyed was not cause for elation or relaxation nor was it cause for undue pessimism or fear.

It simply demonstrated how much work we in the free world have to do and how long and hard a struggle must be our fate as Americans in this generation as the chief defenders of the cause of liberty.

HOPEFUL ON LAOS

The one area which afforded some immediate prospect of accord was Laos. Both sides endorsed the concept of a neutral and independent Laos, much in the manner of Burma or Cambodia.

And of critical importance to the current conference on Laos in Geneva, both sides recognized the importance of an effective cease-fire. It is urgent that this be translated into new attitudes at Geneva, enabling the International Control Commission to do its duty, to make certain that a cease-fire is enforced and maintained.

I am hopeful that progress can be made on this matter in the coming days at Geneva, so that it would greatly improve international atmosphere.

DIFFICULTIES OVER TEST BAN, BERLIN

No such hope emerged, however, with respect to the other deadlocked Geneva conference seeking a treaty to ban nuclear tests.

Mr. Khrushchev made it clear that there could not be a neutral administrator in his opinion because no one was truly neutral, that a Soviet veto would have to apply to acts of enforcement, that inspection was only a subterfuge for espionage in the absence of total disarmament, and that the present test-ban negotiations appeared futile.

In short, our hopes for an end to nuclear tests, for an end to the spread of nuclear weapons, and for some slowing down of the arms race, have been struck a serious blow.

Nevertheless, the stakes are too important for us to abandon the draft treaty we have offered at Geneva.

But our most somber talks were on the subject of Germany and Berlin. I made it clear to Mr. Khrushchev that the security of Western Europe and therefore our own security are deeply involved in our presence and our access rights to West Berlin, that those rights are based on law not on suffrage; and that we are determined to maintain those rights at any risk and thus our obligation to the people of West Berlin and their right to choose their own future.

Mr. Khrushchev, in turn, presented his views in detail. And his presentation will be the subject of further communications.

But we are not seeking to change the present situation. A binding German peace treaty is a matter for all who were at war with Germany, and we and our allies cannot abandon our obligations to the people of West Berlin.

KHRUSHCHEV SEES COMMUNIST TRIUMPH

Generally, Mr. Khrushchev did not talk in terms of war. He believes the world will move his way without resort to force. He spoke of his nation's achievements in space. He stressed his intention to outdo us in industrial production, to outtrade us, to prove to the world the superiority of his system over ours.

Most of all, he predicted the triumph of communism in the new and less-developed countries. He was certain that the tide there was moving his way, that the revolution of rising peoples would eventually be a Communist revolution, and that the so-called wars of liberation supported by the Kremlin would replace the old methods of direct aggression and invasion.

In the Nineteen Forties and early Fifties the great danger was from Communist armies marching across free borders, which we saw in Korea. Our nuclear monopoly helped to prevent this in other areas.

Now we face a new and different threat. We no longer have a nuclear monopoly. Their missiles, they believe, will hold off our missiles, and their troops can match our troops should we intervene in these so-called wars of liberation.

Thus the local conflict they support can turn in their favor through guerrillas or insurgents or subversion. A small group of disciplined Communists could exploit discontent and misery in a country where the average income may be \$60 or \$70 a year and seize control, therefore, of an entire country without Communist troops ever crossing any international frontier.

This is the Communist theory. But I believe just as strongly that time will prove it wrong, that liberty and independence and self-determination, not communism, is the future of man and that free men have the will and the resources to win the struggle for freedom.

But it is clear that this struggle in this area of the new and poorer nations will be a continuing crisis of this decade.

FIGHT AGAINST POVERTY URGED

Mr. Khrushchev made one point which I wish to pass on. He said there are many disorders throughout the world and he should not be blamed for them all. He is quite right.

It is easy to dismiss as Communist-inspired every anti-government or anti-American riot, every overthrow of a corrupt regime or every mass protest against misery and despair.

But these are not all Communist inspired. The Communists move in to exploit them, to infiltrate their leadership, to ride their crest to victory. But the Communists did not create the condition which caused them.

In short, the hopes of freedom in these areas which see so much poverty and illiteracy, so many children who are sick, so many children who die in the first year, so many families without homes, so many families without hope, the future for freedom in these areas rests with the local peoples and their government.

If they have the will to determine their own future, if their governments have the support of their own people, if their honest and progressive measures helping their people have inspired confidence and zeal, then no guerrilla or insurgent action can succeed.

But where those conditions do not exist, a military guarantee against external attack from across a border offers little protection against internal decay.

Yet all this does not mean that our nation and the West and the free world can only sit by. On the contrary, we have an historic opportunity to help these countries build their societies until they are so strong and broadly based that only an outside invasion could topple them. And that threat, we know, can be stopped.

We can train and equip their forces to resist Communist-supplied insurrections. We can help develop the industrial and agricultural base on which new living standards can be built.

We can encourage better administration and better education and better tax and land distribution, and a better life for the people. All this and more we can do because we have the talent and the resources to do it if we would only use and share them.

FOREIGN AID REQUIRED

I know that there is a great deal of feeling in the United States that we have carried the burden of economic assistance long enough. But these countries that we are now supporting -- stretching all the way along from the top of Europe, through the Middle East, down through Saigon -- are now subject to great efforts internally in many of them to seize control.

If we're not prepared to assist them in making a better life for their people, then I believe that the prospects for freedom in those areas are uncertain. We must, I believe, assist them, if we are determined to meet with commitments of assistance our words against the Communist advance.

The burden is heavy. We have carried it for many years. But I believe that this fight is not over, this battle goes on. And we have to play our part in it. And therefore, I hope again that we will assist these people, so that they can remain free.

It was fitting that Congress opened its hearings on our new foreign military and economic aid programs in Washington at the very time that Mr. Khrushchev's words in Vienna were demonstrating as nothing else could, the need for that very program.

It should be well run, effectively administered. But I believe we must do it. And I hope that you and the American people will support it again, because I think it is vitally important to the security of these areas.

There's no use talking against the Communist advance unless we're willing to meet our responsibilities, however burdensome they may be.

I do not justify this aid merely on the grounds of anti-communism. It is a recognition of our opportunity and obligation to help these people be free. And we are not alone. I found that the people of France, for example, were doing far more in Africa in the way of aiding independent nations than our own country was, but I know that foreign aid is a burden that is keenly felt, and I can only say that we have no more crucial obligation now.

My stay in England was short, but the visit gave me a chance to confer privately again with Prime Minister Macmillan, just as others of our party in Vienna were conferring yesterday with General de Gaulle and Chancellor Adenauer.

We all agreed that there is work to be done in the West, and from our conversations have come agreed steps to get on with that work.

Our day in London, capped by a meeting with Queen Elizabeth and Prince Philip, was a strong reminder at the end of a long journey that the West remains united in its determination to hold to its standards.

May I conclude by saying simply that I am glad to be home. We have in this trip admired splendid places and seen stirring sights, but we are glad to be home. No demonstration of support abroad could mean so much as the support which you, the American people, have so generously given to our country.

With that support, I am not fearful of the future. We must be determined. We must be courageous. We must accept both risks and burdens. But with the will and the work freedom will prevail.

Good night and thank you very much.

TEXT OF THE PRESIDENT'S JUNE 2 PARIS NEWS CONFERENCE

Following is the complete text of President Kennedy's June 2 press conference in Paris, France, the 12th of his term, held four weeks after the 11th (Weekly Report p. 819):

Mr. Secretary of State, Ambassador Alphand, Ambassador Bonnet, Ambassador Gavin, M. Redmond, ladies and gentlemen:

I do not think it altogether inappropriate to introduce myself to this audience. I am the man who accompanied Jacqueline Kennedy to Paris, and I have enjoyed it.

I am also happy to have an opportunity to express publicly my appreciation to President and Mrs. de Gaulle for the hospitality and kindness which they have shown to us since our visit to Paris. I must say also, as I said to the General, that my most vivid impression during my visit here was not even the extraordinary spectacle which we all witnessed last night, which reminded us of the long reach into history which this country possesses, but rather was the signs of vigor and vitality and force possessed by the French people themselves.

I do not say that riding in a car through rainy streets is the best method of making a determination of national character, but I have ridden through many streets and I must say it is a most effective method of determining the quality of the people, and I think any American who shares the experiences we have had during the past two days in the sunshine on occasion, in the rain more often, would come away from this country with a feeling of confidence and hope.

TRADITIONAL ASSOCIATION

I come on the same mission which occupied many of my predecessors, stretching all the way back to President Wilson at the conclusion of the First World War, and that is how it is possible to bind more intimately for the common interest France and the United States, Europe and the United States.

This is not altogether a new effort. I recall in my first days in the Congress of the United States in 1947, '48 and '49, when the great steps which were proposed on a bipartisan basis by the American people to assist in the reconstruction of Europe were among the most foresighted and farsighted actions in which my country has been engaged, the Truman Doctrine, the British loan, the aid for Greece and Turkey, the Marshall Plan and later NATO.

The United States, I believe can be proud of these programs, and of the great results that they helped to produce. Without them it is possible that the whole history of Western Europe since 1945 would now be entirely different. Even today the basic concepts

suggested in these programs form the essential part of the foreign policy of the United States. But these concepts alone are not adequate for our European policies in the Nineteen Sixties. All of the power relationships in the world have changed in the last fifteen years, and therefore, our policies must take these changes into account.

CHANGE IN EUROPE

First is the change in Europe itself. In the Nineteen Forties, in Europe, much of it was destroyed, its productive capacity liquidated, divided by a bitter war, inflation rampant, and only those who were optimists of the most extreme sort could have ever predicted the astonishing renaissance of Western Europe today. Its people have energy and confidence. Its economic growth rate is higher than that of the new world, either Canada or the United States. Its dollar shortages have been converted into balances which have even disturbed the monetary stability of the United States.

There were those who said that Europe after the war would be a prisoner again of its ancient rivalries. Today this continent offers the world examples of strength through unity. After fifteen years of extraordinary creative effort and administrative invention, the development of the O.E.E.C., the European Payments Union, the Iron and Steel Community, Euratom, the Common Market and the O.E.C.D., and all of these have only laid the foundation for an even closer economic and political unity.

At the same time, the wise and sympathetic policies followed by France and Great Britain toward those countries which were formerly dependencies have strengthened the free world, the globe around us, and have also increased the prestige, influence and stature of the countries themselves.

CHANGE IN WEAPONRY

The second great change is the change in weaponry. The United States no longer has a nuclear monopoly. The Soviet Union's possession of atomic and hydrogen weapons has increased its willingness to test and probe and push the West. In addition, the intercontinental ballistic missile has made my own country vulnerable to attack and it has also reinforced our view that your dependence and ours is indivisible, that in terms of potential destruction, Washington today is closer to Moscow than this city was to any other city in any other country before the outbreak of World War II.

We must be...constantly strengthening all of our forces...at all levels, deterring war, and keeping the peace by making certain that those who would oppose us know that we are determined to resist aggression, whatever its force, and whatever kind of force is needed to resist it.

The new change in weaponry presents new challenges, with possession by both the United States and the Soviet Union of an atomic and hydrogen capacity, with the great masses of armies that are available to the Sino-Soviet bloc, to the close lines of communication which they have at their service in Western Europe, in the Middle East, in Asia, in Southeast Asia. It indicates the kind of difficult problems that we face in planning for a secure future. But while we keep our arms so strong that no antagonist can believe that he can secure any easy or short cut road to world domination, man's inventive power for keeping the peace has not kept pace.

NUCLEAR TEST AGREEMENT

We still have strong hopes that it will be possible for us to reach an agreement at Geneva on a cessation of nuclear tests. If we cannot reach an agreement on this subject, which is relatively easy to patrol because of the flow of radiation, how is it going to be possible for us to set up the kind of inspection system for the control of other weapons which could lead to disarmament, and, therefore, to a world peace?

I consider this to be a most essential, realistic step, and those of you who in this audience may have reported on the proceedings in Geneva in the Nineteen-twenties and Nineteen-thirties, when many months and years and much energy of a great many different countries were engaged in the subject under fair conditions of goodwill then prevailing, the subject of how to secure an adequate disarmament system which provided security, can judge how difficult it will be for us to do so in the future if we cannot make successfully this step.

SOUTHERN HALF OF GLOBE

Third and most important is the change in the location and the nature of the threat. The cause of freedom is under pressure all over the world. But because of the extraordinary rebirth of Western European strength, the struggle has been switched to other areas where the security of your countries and mine are now being directly threatened, the whole southern half of the globe, where the attack potentially comes not from massive land armies but from subversion and insurrection and despair. Europe has conquered her own internal problems. Those that remain are on the way to solution. The time has now come for us to associate more closely together than ever in the past in a massive and concerted attack on poverty, injustice and oppression, which overshadow so much of the globe.

When the threat of military aggression was the primary one, our posture was defensive. But where the contest is one of human liberty and economic growth, and I tied them both together, as we must always do so because the slogans with which we have associated ourselves have significance and force when they are bound together with a recognition that economic growth and productivity and material well-being are the hand-maidens of liberty, we have the resources in this most extraordinary section of the world, the oldest, and in many ways now among the youngest, allied with the United States and Canada, associated with the countries of Latin America and Africa and Asia, we have an opportunity in our time to fulfill our responsibilities.

In 1779, before France came into the War of Independence, someone said to Benjamin Franklin: "It is a great spectacle that you are putting on in America," and Benjamin Franklin said: "Yes, but the trouble is, the spectators do not pay."

We are not spectators today. We are all contributing, we are all involved, here in this country, here in this community, here in Western Europe, here in my own country, here all around the globe where it is our responsibility to make a maximum contribution. Thank you.

ALGERIA TALKS

Q. In case of the failure of talks at Avion, would the United States be led to intervene more directly in settling the Algerian question, for example, in case of massive support by the Soviet Union and China?

THE PRESIDENT: It is, of course, our hope that the talks now proceeding at Avion will be successful, and I can think of no useful purpose at the present time in planning for the eventuality which was suggested by the question. We should look forward to the present, we should look forward to the effort which is being made to work out a peaceful solution. If that effort should fail, then of course, all of us who are concerned would be expected to participate in appropriate consultations. But for the present and certainly as we look to the future, we look with hope toward those talks.

NATO FORCE GOALS

Q. Will the President indicate how, and how soon, he hopes to induce the negligent European member states of the North Atlantic alliance to fulfill their accepted force goals for NATO's European shield forces?

THE PRESIDENT: Without accepting the presumptions upon which The Los Angeles Times places the question, I am hopeful that all members of the NATO alliance will fulfill the goals to which they are committed. I think it important that in making these goals we make them realistic, that we do not make plans that we have no intention of keeping. So quite obviously, I think it would be in the interests of all that we meet our commitments, and I can assure you that the United States of America will make every effort on its part to carry out its obligations. I will say also that I am interested in the effort which Western Europe and the United States and Canada are making through the O.E.E.C., through D.A.G., to play a more substantial role in economic assistance to the southern part of the globe. This is a great challenge for Western Europe. So we hope that all of us will be willing to bear the burdens that free people must in dangerous days.

NUCLEAR SECRETS

Q. Have you discussed with General de Gaulle the French atomic tests and the attitude of France concerning the Geneva conference on nuclear tests? At what stage of the nuclear development of France will the McMahon Law not forbid the President to pass on American secrets to France?

THE PRESIDENT: In answer to the first part of the question, the answer was we have discussed these matters. In answer to the second, the determination or the interpretation of the McMahon Act is a matter of concern to the Executive and also a matter of great concern to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Congress. I am sure that if a question were raised in regard to the interpretations, the United States Government would attempt to make an appropriate determination.

The third part of the question is -- to what degree -- the responsibility falls most immediately on the President. It is a matter of great concern to many members of the Congress who have given this matter long attention. There are varying views on how it would be interpreted. I would say that the United States Government would make a judgment if a judgment were required after consulting with our partners in the Congress.

May I say that on some of these matters my answers will be less than full and less than satisfactory to you. When this press conference was first planned, I expected to be at the end of my voyage. It comes at a time before General de Gaulle and I have concluded our talks, before a communique has been issued, and beginning tomorrow I face new responsibilities. Therefore, I hope that those whom I leave less than satisfied will at least be sympathetic.

MEETING WITH KHRUSHCHEV

Q. Mr. President, a question by Serge Fliegers of the Hearst Newspapers. What, in your opinion, is the principal aim of a meeting with Mr. Khrushchev at this time and do you feel that you are meeting him with enough cards in your hands?

THE PRESIDENT: To answer the second part of the question first, I consider the power of the United States, plus those countries that are associated with it in the common defense, to give every form of encouragement to any Western leader to discuss matters which concern us with those who occupy positions of responsibility in other parts of the globe. I think Mr. Khrushchev has the same view.

And to the first part of the question, I would say, as I have said before, that the purpose of this meeting is to permit me to make a more precise judgment on those matters which involve the interests of the United States, and the Soviet Union, and those countries which are associated with us and those countries which are members of the Sino-Soviet bloc.

We are involved in two conferences at Geneva. We hope that more progress can be made at both of them. And if there is anything that may be said in the meetings Saturday and Sunday which may improve that prospect, then, of course, that makes the trip worth while. There are other matters also on which we have not come to an agreement with Mr. Khrushchev, and I think it important that we understand fully his viewpoint and all of its implications, and that in return he has the same understanding of our viewpoint.

I said recently that in my lifetime I had been present, alive, during three world wars, and it is impossible to study the origins of each of these struggles without realizing the serious miscalculations which were made by the leaders on both sides.

The most recent example was in our own experience in Korea, where the North Koreans did not seem certain that we would respond immediately upon the occasion of their invasion into South Korea, and where there was serious doubt on the part of the United States that the Chinese Communists would intervene as we moved to the north. In the experience of Europe, you have had similar circumstances.

Therefore, when responsibility is pressed heavily on anyone to make a judgment, it seems to me useful to have as close an understanding of the view of each side as possible. I think that it is most valuable to talk with those with whom we are allied. I also think it is important that we talk to those who are separated from us, because in the final analysis, heavy decisions rest, constitutionally, upon the President of the United States. He must under some conditions make the final judgment himself, and if my judgment may be more lucid, may be based more on reality as a result of this exchange, then I think the trip may be useful.

BERLIN QUESTION

Q. Would you interpret your agreement on Berlin with General de Gaulle? What is the real sense and extent of this agreement?

THE PRESIDENT: The matter on Berlin, of course, will be a matter, I am sure, of discussion tomorrow and Sunday, and therefore I do not think that this is a particularly appropriate time to go into details on the position which we occupy in Berlin as it is a matter, of course, which will be discussed by Mr. Khrushchev and myself. Let me therefore sum it up by saying that I think that neither General de Gaulle nor I would feel it appropriate to have our rights, statutory rights, in West Berlin changed by force or the threat of force.

LAOS NEUTRALITY

Q. Mr. President, in view of the attitude shown by the Soviet and Chinese delegations at the Geneva conference on Laos, do you now feel that the neutrality and independence of that country can be established and insured by an international agreement?

THE PRESIDENT: I think that the prospects are not easy of securing an independent and neutral Laos as we understand it, but we intend to continue to discuss this matter, and we will stay at the conference for as long as we feel that there is some hope of success. The Soviet Union has stated on occasions that it wishes a neutral and independent Laos. If we can come to an agreement on the exact, precise definition of these words, then our progress should be swift.

I will say that the first and most essential step at the present time is to provide an effective mechanism for controlling the cease-fire. If we can secure a cease-fire, then we can move on to those other matters which must be settled by the conference. It is a difficult area. It presents us with many difficult decisions. But I cannot believe that anyone would imperil the peace by failing to recognize the importance of reaching an agreement in this country, by breaking up a conference and refusing to agree to a cease-fire and a government and a people which can maintain their neutrality against outside intervention from whatever source.

ROLE OF FRANCE

Q. How does President Kennedy consider the role of France in Europe? Is it felt closer consultations might take place between London, Paris and Washington on the military problem?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, I do, and the reason I came to Paris was to participate in that kind of consultation. Consultation does not always regardless of how long it may go on, does not always provide unanimity at the end of the consultation. But there is a more precise understanding of those areas where there is agreement and there is a more precise understanding of the reasons for positions which may be taken on which there is not agreement.

So I regard conversations such as I have had for the last two days, and they have been more than eight hours with President de Gaulle, I regard them as most valuable. And I believe that, more than talking about consulting, it is important to consult. And we have done that and will continue to do it, I hope with increasing intimacy, in the months ahead.

COMMON MARKET

Q. Mr. President, did you discuss Britain's entry into the common market with President De Gaulle, and what did he say? And does the United States advise the French Government to facilitate the entry of Britain into the common market as a full member?

THE PRESIDENT -- I cannot believe that Mr. Cadet or Mr. Johnson (the questioners, British journalists) have been in Paris less time than I have, but nevertheless I am sure that even if they had been here only in the last few hours they would know that on those matters on which, regarding General De Gaulle's views, that the most authoritative place to secure them is General De Gaulle.

AID TO NEW COUNTRIES

Q. What can the United States do and the Allies do to strengthen the defense of liberty and justice in the eyes of under-developed countries today that appear as defending the privileges of the whites because of their high standard of living? Could you say, as regards Africa and South America, by what means the United States intends helping the peoples of these continents to undertake their revolution of peace and equality and independence as you did yourselves?

THE PRESIDENT: I think the question suggests a basic problem which is not easy to solve. We are a prosperous people. Some of us in the Atlantic community have held colonial possessions and we, therefore, have not always experienced, in my own hemisphere, in Africa or Asia, the happiest relations with the people who are involved.

But I will say, on the other hand, that the record of the last fifteen years is an extraordinary one, as country after country has gained its independence, by free means in many cases -- in fact, in the majority of cases -- who were once held as colonial possessions. This is an extraordinary record for the Western world and one not matched by the Eastern world, which continues to hold areas under its control, not by free means.

I think that it is not enough, as I said in my speech, that we give our slogans, though the slogans cloak very basic principles, but I feel we must make a greater concerted effort than we have made in the past on a long-term basis, to demonstrate to these people that through free choice they may be able to solve their material problems.

I do not want to see the United States, and I am sure that those of you who are Europeans do not want to see Europe, associated with reactionary groups within these countries who seek only to maintain their own position. We want to assist and be associated with those groups who look to the future, who are identified with the aspirations of their people. Otherwise, our days in some of these areas are on the yellow leaf.

I will say that one of the matters which I discussed with General de Gaulle was the great hope which we had in the Western Hemisphere that Europe would play an increasingly larger role. Its traditional ties, its cultural affinities, its ties of language, of Latin America, are extremely intimate with Europe, and I believe that there is a great opportunity for Europe, not only to serve the general cause, not only in Africa and Asia, but also in the hemisphere of the Americas. And it was a source of great satisfaction to me that General de Gaulle, as he demonstrated in his speech of some weeks ago, shares strongly that view of the obligation of this area.

C.I.A. ALGIERS ROLE DENIED

Q. Mr. President, has there been an investigation of the case of the reports circulated about alleged Central Intelligence Agency involvement in the April 22 Algiers revolt of the generals, and would you care to comment on this?

THE PRESIDENT: I feel that the goodwill of this visit may be rapidly diminishing. Let me say that I have not been informed, and all my information is to the contrary, that there was any involvement by members of the C.I.A. or any other members of the American Government. I think that the Foreign Minister discussed that matter quite clearly in his report of some weeks ago, and I think that the statements which our Government has made in regard to its association with this country and its Government I think obviously answer it.

So in answer to your question, I know of no basis for such a charge. I have never received information on it. I assume I would have and, therefore, I regard the question as not in fact true.

IMPRESSIONS OF VISIT

Q. What has struck you the most during your visit in France and your talks with General de Gaulle?

THE PRESIDENT: In France, as I said, I think is the vitality of a very old race, which the French people are. In General de Gaulle I am having a conversation with the only active figure who played a major role in the Second World War who is now involved in major policy matters affecting the security of the Western world.

President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, Marshal Stalin have all disappeared from the positions of responsibility. General de Gaulle remains. And he is faithful to the same concepts of the strength of France and the unity of Europe as he has been for many years.

It has been my hope in these conversations that he has a renewed appreciation of how seriously we consider our ties with France and Western Europe. I hope from our conversations that he understands how our new Government in the United States is firmly committed to the security of this area and means to implement its commitments.

COMMUNIST CHINA

Q. Mr. President, how can Communist China normalize her relations with the West and be admitted to United Nations membership?

THE PRESIDENT: I would say that the normalization of relations which, of course, peaceful relations -- which is in the common interest of us all, between China and the West -- I would hope that they would be brought about. But we desire peace and we desire to live in amity with the Chinese people. But I will say that since long before I assumed office and in the first days of our new Administration, before really any actions were taken, the attacks upon our Government and the United States were constant, immediate, and in many cases malevolent.

The debate which took place last fall between Communist parties indicated that the Chinese planned to take an extremely belligerent attitude and role toward us and those with whom we are associated. We hope that policy changes. We want goodwill. But it takes two to make peace, and I am hopeful that the Chinese will be persuaded that a peaceful existence with its neighbors represents the best hope for us all. We would welcome it. But I do not see evidence of it today.

IF HE WERE KHRUSHCHEV

Q. If you were Mr. Khrushchev, what would you think of the political position of Mr. Kennedy?

THE PRESIDENT: If I were -- I suppose if I were in Mr. Khrushchev's place, it would be because I was Mr. Khrushchev and had lived his life, and therefore I would look to the West and I would see a good deal of reports of disagreement. I would see where all Western leaders may not agree on every issue. I would see where distinguished American correspondents who speak with great influence take a different view on what actions the United States should take.

I would see Mr. Kennedy under critical attack by many of his fellow countrymen, as well as those who live across the ocean. I would look at my own country, where everything on the surface

is serene, where nobody criticizes or opposes, and everyone is united behind me. And, therefore, I would draw a conclusion that the tide of history was moving with me.

If I were Mr. Khrushchev, however, and had spent some time in the West, I would take a somewhat different view of the tide of history. I would read those distinguished spokesmen who had prophesized the imminent collapse of Europe in 1947 and 1948. I would read those others who had felt it would be impossible for us to associate more closely together and I would also recognize that dissent and controversy brings a kind of vitality and also protects individual liberty. And I would consider that possibly we could improve Russian society.

I will say that I don't agree very basically with one of the assumptions which a good many Communists put forward, and that is from the events of the last fifteen years they have made the judgment that the tide is determined and in their favor. You cannot look at the relations between the countries behind the Iron Curtain, for example the rather strange relationship between Albania and China, or between Yugoslavia and Albania and Russia, or between all the other countries of the bloc, to feel that if time were permitted to be successful, that there would not inevitably be the same rivalries which we now see already in evidence.

The difficulty, of course, is that Caesar and Pompey and Anthony and Octavius and the others did not fall out until they were successful. We cannot afford the luxury of permitting them the kind of success which will prove them wrong finally in the kind of world of which they witness.

We have to maintain our position. And therefore I hope Mr. Khrushchev is not misled by those signs of democracy which we understand but they do not, but instead recognizes that the United States of America, divided as it may be on many important questions, including governmental spending, is united in its determination to fulfill its commitments and to play the role that history and its own free choice have brought upon it in these years.

So I may say, as I said at the beginning, I go to Vienna with a good deal of confidence, and I go to Vienna with more confidence as a result of my last two days.

JOINT COMMUNIQUE

KENNEDY-DE GAULLE

Following is the text of the June 5 communique issued by President Kennedy and French President Charles de Gaulle following their meetings in Paris:

The President of the United States of America paid a state visit to Paris from May 31 to June 2. This visit itself is evidence of the close and friendly relationship traditionally characteristic of the history of the two countries. During the visit there have been long talks between Gen. de Gaulle, President of the French Republic, and President Kennedy.

The two Presidents discussed the principal issues in the present international situation with regard both to relations between the United States and France and to their policies in all parts of the world. In the course of these discussions, which were both direct and searching, they examined the position of the two countries with regard to the Soviet Union and the Communist world; and the activities of these two countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America, including aid to underdeveloped countries.

They also examined means of strengthening the Atlantic alliance, that fundamental association of free nations.

These conversations have shown the fundamental agreement which exists between the two Presidents. In particular President de Gaulle and President Kennedy confirmed the identity of their views on their commitments and responsibilities toward Berlin.

The conversations which have just taken place allowed the President of France and the President of the United States to know each other and to set forth fully the respective positions of the two countries, taking into account the interests and responsibilities incumbent upon each of them.

Thus the talks have made an essential contribution to the development of relations between France and the United States. The deep solidarity which binds the two nations together in the tradition of Franco-American friendship remains the basis of these relations.

KENNEDY-KHRUSHCHEV

Following is the text of the June 5 communique issued by President Kennedy and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev following their talks in Vienna:

President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev have concluded two days of useful meetings, during which they have reviewed the relationships between the United States and the U.S.S.R., as well as other questions that are of interest to the two states.

Today, in the company of their advisers, they discussed the problems of nuclear testing, disarmament, and Germany. The President and the Chairman (of the Council of Ministers) reaffirmed their support of a neutral and independent Laos under a Government chosen by the Laotians themselves, and of international agreements for insuring that neutrality and independence, and in this connection they have recognized the importance of an effective cease-fire.

The President and the Chairman have agreed to maintain contact on all questions of interest to the two countries and for the whole world.

KENNEDY-MACMILLAN

Following is the text of the June 5 communique issued by President Kennedy and British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan following their talks in London:

After his visits to Paris and Vienna, President Kennedy paid a short private visit to London on June 4 and 5. This gave the President the opportunity to review the world situation with the Prime Minister in the light of his talks with President De Gaulle and Mr. Khrushchev. The President and Mr. Macmillan were thus able to continue the close personal contact begun in Washington two months ago.

Their discussion covered the major problems, both economic and political, and revealed once again the close agreement of the two governments in pursuing their common purposes.

Occasion was given to review the need for economic collaboration and expansion in the general interest of developed and under-developed countries alike.

On Laos, the President and the Prime Minister noted with satisfaction the agreement in Vienna on the need for an effective cease fire which, in their opinion, should lead to progress in Geneva towards an agreement permitting the establishment of a neutral and independent Laos.

Particular attention was also given to the nuclear tests conference and to the question of disarmament.

The situation in regard to Germany was reviewed and there was full agreement on the necessity of maintaining the rights and obligations of the allied governments in Berlin.

YOUTH TRAINING, EMPLOYMENT

Following is the text of a June 7 letter from the President to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House transmitting a draft bill for employment and training of youths: (See p. 946)

My dear Mr. President: (My dear Mr. Speaker:)

I am transmitting herewith a draft bill to provide useful employment and training on a pilot basis for young men and women between the ages of 16 and 22.

As set forth in more detail in the enclosed letter to me from the Secretary of Labor and the accompanying memorandum, this legislation would provide pilot programs over a three-year period, designed to develop the most effective methods of assisting our young people in acquiring the skills necessary for productive employment. The draft legislation would establish three different pilot programs through which young people can equip themselves for suitable employment: (1) on-the-job training; (2) a Youth Conservation Corps, and (3) local public service and public works programs performed in the areas in which the youths reside.

The progress we make as a nation depends upon the use we make of our resources, including manpower. And it is especially important that our young people -- the real key to our national future -- be prepared to contribute to our economic growth.

Forecasts of the difficulty they can expect to meet in the next few years in finding suitable employment make it clear that we must act without delay. The approaches to this problem proposed in the attached draft will provide a solid base upon which an effective program can be built. We believe too, that they will stimulate action by all elements of our communities, both public and private, in developing employment opportunities and training for our youth.

A letter similar to this is being sent to the Speaker of the House.

Sincerely,
John F. Kennedy

OTHER STATEMENTS

Other recent public statements by President Kennedy (for previous statements see Weekly Report p. 924):

May 24 -- Remarks welcoming the return of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson from his Southeast Asian Trip.

May 24 -- Remarks following meeting with Argentina Minister of Economy Roberto T. Alemann affirming continued "cooperative efforts of the governments of Argentina and the United States."

May 24 -- Message to Congress transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1961 providing for reorganization of the National Labor Relations Board. The Plan was similar to Reorganization Plan No. 1 (Weekly Report p. 896)

May 25 -- Remarks on signing of joint statement by Lockheed Aircraft Corp. and President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. The President said: "This plan is a milestone in the history of civil rights in this country."

May 26 -- Letter to the Speaker of the House transmitting proposed increases of \$549 million for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, \$130,898,000 for the Small Business Administration, \$2,400,000 for the U.S. Information Agency, \$53 million for the Department of Commerce, and \$237 million for the Defense Department.

May 26 -- Letter to the Speaker of the House transmitting a proposed Defense Department \$40 million supplemental appropriation for fiscal 1961.

May 26 -- Letter to the President of the Senate transmitting proposed increases in fiscal 1962 budget increases of \$1,376,000 for the National Labor Relations Board, \$200,000 for the National Mediation Board, \$219,342,000 for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and \$497,700,000 for the Labor Department.

May 26 -- Release of the President's and Mrs. Kennedy's schedules for their visit to France.

May 26 -- Executive Order No. 10945 establishing a program for resolving labor disputes at missile and space sites. A Missile Sites Labor Commission composed of the Labor Secretary, chairman, the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, vice-chairman, three public members, three representatives of labor and three representatives of management was created to "establish such procedures as appear to it necessary and appropriate to produce a satisfactory settlement" of labor relations problems at missile sites. (Weekly Report p. 929)

May 26 -- Announcement that the Federal Housing Administration had been directed to reduce interest rate ceilings on FHA-insured mortgages from 5-1/2 to 5-1/4 percent, that the Federal National Mortgage Assn. would step up its purchases of mortgages in the secondary market, that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board through Bank advances at lower rates, would encourage reductions in mortgage interest rates charged by savings and loan associations. (Weekly Report p. 929)

May 26 -- Announcement that Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson would undertake a special mission to consult with South American government officials about perfecting and accelerating the Inter-American program for social and economic development to advance the purposes of the "Alliance for Progress." (Weekly Report p. 441)

May 27 -- Letter to the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, authorizing such funds as may be necessary to assist parts of the State of Missouri designated disaster areas as a result of flood damage in May.

May 27 -- Letter to Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization authorizing such funds as may be necessary to assist parts of the State of Illinois designated disaster areas as a result of flood damage in May.

Capitol Briefs

COMMUNIST PARTY DECISIONS

The Supreme Court June 5 sustained a section of the Internal Security Act of 1950 requiring "Communist action" organizations to register with the Government, and it upheld the constitutionality of the clause of the Smith Act of 1940 making it a crime for a person to be a member of an organization which he knows is advocating the violent overthrow of the Government.

Both decisions were made by identical 5-4 votes. The majority was made up of Justices Felix Frankfurter, Tom C. Clark, John Marshall Harlan, Charles E. Whitaker and Potter Stewart. Voting with the minority were Chief Justice Earl Warren and Justices Hugo L. Black, William O. Douglas and William J. Brennan Jr.

The decisions were the first definitive Supreme Court rulings on both of these statutory provisions and constituted the most important legal victories for the Government in the internal security field in several years. They put the strongest restrictions yet on the Communist Party.

The Internal Security Act held that the party must register a list of its officers and members, must account for its funds, and must list all printing presses and machines it owns or controls. The Act said if it failed to do so within 30 days after a final order was issued by the Subversive Activities Control Board, the party could be fined \$10,000 a day. Members who violated the Act could be fined \$10,000 and jailed for five years for each day they failed to register. Members of a registered group would be barred from Government employment and forbidden to apply for or use a U.S. passport. The party would lose tax exemptions and would have to stamp its mail as from a "Communist organization."

In upholding the registration requirement (Communist Party v. Subversive Activities Control Board), the Court refused to consider at the time any of the legal consequences of the registration. It said any penalties could be challenged later if they were applied against the party or its members. The majority also refused to consider a contention that by registering, officers of the party would identify themselves and make themselves punishable under the Smith Act, and that this would constitute forced self-incrimination in violation of the Fifth Amendment.

Justice Frankfurter said that in some circumstances the names of an organization's members might not constitutionally be extracted from it. The Court so held in the case of the National Assn. for the Advancement of Colored People. (Weekly Report p. 880)

The majority opinion said the pertinent fact was that the Communist party was a foreign-controlled organization working as part of a world movement, employing "every combination of possible means...to destroy the Government." The opinion also specifically rejected the argument that registration would infringe on the freedom of association guaranteed by the First Amendment.

Justices Brennan and Douglas agreed that registration and disclosure did not violate the First Amendment, but said the Court should consider whether making officers sign the statement violated the Fifth Amendment. Justice Douglas also said the Fifth Amendment barred forced disclosure of members' names by the party.

Justices Warren and Brennan said making officers sign registration statements violated the Fifth Amendment. Justice Black said the Internal Security Act was wrong because it was based on the principle that American people cannot be trusted to distinguish between true and false ideas. He said the freedoms of the First Amendment "must be accorded to the ideas we hate or sooner or later they will be denied to the ideas we cherish."

The Smith Act had been challenged on the grounds that in outlawing membership it limited freedom of speech and association guarantees of the First Amendment. The argument was that the statute covered not actual attempts to overthrow the Government, but membership in a group that merely advocated overthrow, no matter how unlikely the success. In the majority decision, Justice Harlan said, "We can discern no reason why membership, when it constitutes a purposeful form of complicity in a group engaging in this same forbidden advocacy, should receive...protection from the guarantees of the First Amendment." The decision held that to be convicted a person had to be an "active" member and have a "specific intent to bring about violent overthrow."

Under these requirements, the Court upheld, 5-4, the conviction of Junius Irving Scales (Scales v. U.S.), but unanimously rejected that of John Francis Noto (Noto v. U.S.). Justice Harlan said the Government had failed to prove that the organization Noto belonged to did more than teach abstractly the overthrow of the Government. He said there must be proof of a call to violence.

ADVERTISING COUNCIL

Administration spokesmen June 5 told the Advertising Council Gross National Product would increase to \$530 billion by the end of the year but the unemployment rate would remain at 6 percent in spite of economic recovery. Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon predicted a balanced budget in fiscal 1963 but said there would be a \$3.75 billion deficit in fiscal 1962 as a result of decreased revenues caused by the recession.

Walter W. Heller, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, said demands for higher wages and prices would produce inflationary pressures in fiscal 1962. He said the Government would not seek to control wages and prices in peacetime but would rely on industry and unions to exercise "self-discipline."

Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson June 6 told the Council the U.S. failed to communicate its desires and objectives to the world. Johnson said the Administration's foreign aid program was necessary to insure U.S. security and preserve freedom in the underdeveloped world.

PRICE STUDY

In a special economic report prepared for the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, a panel of six international economists -- one American, five Europeans -- said inflationary pressures of the past seven years in the U.S. were due largely to the activities of both organized labor and "big business."

"Wage increases for important groups of workers of the magnitude of the 1955 and 1956 automobile and steel settlements were almost bound to set off a self-defeating wage and price-wage spiral," the report said. "There is reason to believe that attempts in a few industries to raise rates of profit at high levels of sales, or to have a lower break-even point, contributed to the rise of industrial prices," it added.

CQ Senate Votes 56 through 60.

Senate Approves \$790.6 Million Interior Appropriation, Takes Up Housing Bill, Rejects Three Republican Amendments

56. HR 6345. Appropriate \$790.6 million for the Interior Department and related agencies in fiscal 1962. Dirksen (R Ill.) amendment to reduce by \$10 million -- to \$139,200,000 -- funds for the protection and management of forest lands. Agreed to 77-13 (D 46-13; R 31-0), June 7, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position. (See story p. 940)
57. HR 6345. Gruening (D Alaska) amendment adding \$375,000 for a rehabilitated Interior Department ship to service ports in Northern Alaska. Agreed to 48-43 (D 48-12; R 0-31), June 7, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.
58. S 1922. Housing Act of 1961, authorizing \$6.2 billion in loans and grants for existing or new housing programs. Capehart (R Ind.) amendment to change the proposed home

rehabilitation program, reducing the maximum loan from \$10,000 to \$7,000 and the maximum term from 25 to 15 years. Rejected 35-56 (D 9-52; R 26-4), June 7, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. (See story p. 937)

59. S 1922. Capehart (R Ind.) amendment to eliminate provisions for 40-year, no-downpayment loans to public and non-profit agencies to build rental housing for moderate-income families. Rejected 41-50 (D 14-46; R 27-4), June 7, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.

60. S 1922. Javits (R N.Y.) amendment to delete the moderate-income housing provisions of the bill and substitute a plan to establish a Government-owned corporation to assist in providing such housing. Rejected 25-64 (D 0-60; R 25-4), June 7, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.

TOTAL						DEMOCRATIC						REPUBLICAN					
Vote No.	56	57	58	59	60	Vote No.	56	57	58	59	60	Vote No.	56	57	58	59	60
Yea	77	48	35	41	25	Yea	46	48	9	14	0	Yea	31	0	26	27	25
Nay	13	43	56	50	64	Nay	13	12	52	46	60	Nay	0	31	4	4	4

56 57 58 59 60						56 57 58 59 60						56 57 58 59 60						Y Record Vote For (yea). ✓ Paired For. † Announced For, CQ Poll For. X Record Vote Against (nay). X Paired Against. - Announced Against, CQ Poll Against. ? Absent, General Pair, "Present," Did not announce or answer Poll.	
ALABAMA						INDIANA						NEBRASKA							56 57 58 59 60
Hill	Y	Y	N	N	N	Hartke	Y	Y	N	N	N	Curtis	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		
Sparkman	Y	Y	N	N	N	Capehart	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Hruska	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		
ALASKA						IOWA						NEVADA						56 57 58 59 60	
Bartlett	N	Y	N	N	N	Hickenlooper	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Bible	Y	Y	N	N	N		
Gruening	Y	Y	N	N	N	Miller	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Cannon	Y	Y	N	N	N		
ARIZONA						KANSAS						NEW HAMPSHIRE						56 57 58 59 60	
Hayden	Y	N	-	N	N	Carlson	? ? ? ? ?					Bridges	✓	X	†	✓	?		
Goldwater	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Schoeppel	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Cotton	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		
ARKANSAS						KENTUCKY						NEW JERSEY						56 57 58 59 60	
Fulbright	X	X	N	N	N	Cooper	X	X	†	Y	Y	Williams	Y	Y	N	N	N		
McClellan	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Morton	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Case	Y	N	N	N	Y		
CALIFORNIA						LOUISIANA						NEW MEXICO						56 57 58 59 60	
Engle	Y	Y	N	N	N	Ellender	Y	N	N	X	N	Anderson	Y	Y	N	N	N		
Kuchel	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Long	N	Y	N	N	N	Chavez	✓	✓	-	X	X		
COLORADO						MAINE						NEW YORK						56 57 58 59 60	
Carroll	N	Y	N	N	N	Muskie	N	Y	N	N	N	Javits	Y	N	N	N	Y		
Allott	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Smith	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Keating	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		
CONNECTICUT						MARYLAND						NORTH CAROLINA						56 57 58 59 60	
Dodd	Y	Y	N	X	N	Beall	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Ervin	Y	Y	N	Y	N		
Bush	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Butler	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Jordan	Y	Y	N	Y	N		
DELAWARE						MASSACHUSETTS						NORTH DAKOTA						56 57 58 59 60	
Boggs	Y	N	N	N	Y	Smith	Y	Y	N	N	N	Burdick	X	Y	N	N	N		
Williams	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Saltonstall	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Young	Y	N	Y	Y	✓		
FLORIDA						MICHIGAN						OHIO						56 57 58 59 60	
Holland	Y	N	N	Y	N	Hart	N	Y	N	N	N	Lausche	Y	N	Y	Y	N		
Smathers	†	N	N	Y	N	McNamara	Y	Y	N	N	N	Young	Y	Y	N	N	N		
GEORGIA						MINNESOTA						OKLAHOMA						56 57 58 59 60	
Russell	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Humphrey	N	Y	N	N	X	Kerr	Y	Y	N	N	N		
Talmadge	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	McCarthy	N	✓	N	N	N	Monroney	Y	Y	N	N	N		
HAWAII						MISSISSIPPI						OREGON						56 57 58 59 60	
Long	Y	Y	N	N	N	Eastland	? ?	Y	Y	Y	N	Morse	Y	Y	N	N	N		
Fong	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Tennis	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Neuberger	Y	Y	N	N	N		
IDAHO						MISSOURI						PENNSYLVANIA						56 57 58 59 60	
Church	Y	Y	N	Y	X	Long	Y	Y	N	N	N	Clark	Y	Y	N	N	N		
Duorsbak	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Symington	Y	Y	N	N	N	Scott	Y	N	Y	N	Y		
ILLINOIS						MONTANA						RHODE ISLAND						56 57 58 59 60	
Douglas	Y	Y	N	N	N	Mansfield	Y	Y	N	N	N	Pastore	Y	Y	N	N	N		
Dirksen	Y	N	Y	Y	✓	Metcalf	Y	Y	N	N	N	Pell	Y	Y	N	N	N		

Democrats in this type; Republicans in italics

Senate Continues Voting on Administration Housing Bill, Rejects, Then Restores 40-Year FHA Mortgage Program

61. S 1922. Housing Act of 1961. Capehart (R Ind.) amendment to reduce the maximum term of moderate-income sales housing loans from 40 to 30 years and ease the rate of mortgage payments. Rejected 39-57 (D 12-50; R 27-7), June 8, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. (See story p. 937)
62. S 1922. Gore (D Tenn.) amendment to eliminate moderate-income sales and rental housing programs. Agreed to 49-44 (D 19-41; R 30-3), June 8, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.

63. S 1922. Capehart (R Ind.) amendment to reduce public housing units authorized by the bill from 100,000 to 37,000. Rejected 34-58 (D 11-48; R 23-10, June 8, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.
74. S 1922. Sparkman (D Ala.) amendment, modified by Capehart, to restore the moderate-income housing provisions to the bill but require a downpayment on sales housing. Agreed to 47-42 (D 43-15; R 4-27), June 8, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position. (Other votes taken June 8 will appear in the next Weekly Report.)

TOTAL					DEMOCRATIC					REPUBLICAN				
Vote No.	61	62	63	74	Vote No.	61	62	63	74	Vote No.	61	62	63	74
Yea	39	49	34	47	Yea	12	19	11	43	Yea	27	30	23	4
Nay	57	44	58	42	Nay	50	41	48	15	Nay	7	3	10	27

61 62 63 74					61 62 63 74					61 62 63 74				
ALABAMA					INDIANA					NEBRASKA				
Hill	N	N	N	✓	Hortke	N	N	N	Y	Curtis	Y	Y	Y	N
Sparkman	N	N	N	Y	Capehart	Y	Y	Y	N	Hruska	Y	Y	Y	X
ALASKA					IOWA					NEVADA				
Bartlett	N	N	N	Y	Hickenlooper	Y	Y	Y	N	Bible	N	N	N	Y
Gruening	N	N	N	Y	Miller	Y	Y	Y	N	Cannon	N	N	N	Y
ARIZONA					KANSAS					NEW HAMPSHIRE				
Hayden	N	N	Y	Y	Carlson	Y	Y	Y	N	Bridges	✓	✓	✓	-
Goldwater	Y	✓	✓	-	Schoeppel	Y	Y	Y	N	Cotton	Y	Y	Y	N
ARKANSAS					KENTUCKY					NEW JERSEY				
Fulbright	N	N	N	Y	Cooper	N	Y	N	N	Williams	N	N	N	Y
McClellan	Y	Y	Y	N	Morton	Y	Y	Y	N	Case	N	N	N	Y
CALIFORNIA					LOUISIANA					NEW MEXICO				
Engle	N	N	X	Y	Ellender	N	Y	X	N	Anderson	-	X	-	✓
Kuchel	N	Y	N	N	Long	Y	Y	N	Y	Chavez	X	X	X	✓
COLORADO					MAINE					NEW YORK				
Carroll	N	N	N	Y	Muskie	N	N	N	Y	Javits	N	N	N	Y
Allott	Y	Y	Y	X	Smith	Y	Y	N	N	Keating	Y	Y	N	N
CONNECTICUT					MARYLAND					NORTH CAROLINA				
Dodd	N	N	N	Y	Beall	Y	Y	Y	N	Ervin	Y	Y	Y	N
Bush	Y	Y	Y	N	Butler	Y	Y	Y	N	Jordan	Y	Y	N	N
DELAWARE					MASSACHUSETTS					NORTH DAKOTA				
Boggs	N	N	N	Y	Smith	N	N	N	Y	Burdick	N	N	N	Y
Williams	Y	Y	Y	N	Saltonstall	Y	Y	Y	N	Young	Y	Y	Y	N
FLORIDA					MICHIGAN					OHIO				
Holland	Y	Y	Y	N	Hart	N	N	N	Y	Lausche	Y	Y	N	N
Smathers	N	Y	Y	N	McNamara	N	N	N	Y	Young	N	N	N	✓
GEORGIA					MINNESOTA					OKLAHOMA				
Russell	Y	Y	✓	X	Humphrey	N	N	N	Y	Kerr	N	✓	N	N
Talmadge	N	Y	Y	N	McCarthy	N	N	N	Y	Monroney	N	Y	N	N
HAWAII					MISSISSIPPI					OREGON				
Long	N	N	N	Y	Eastland	Y	Y	Y	X	Morse	N	N	N	Y
Fong	N	Y	N	Y	Stennis	Y	Y	Y	N	Neuberger	N	N	N	Y
IDAHO					MISSOURI					PENNSYLVANIA				
Church	N	Y	N	Y	Long	N	N	N	Y	Clark	N	N	N	Y
Dworsbak	Y	Y	Y	N	Symington	N	Y	N	Y	Scott	Y	Y	N	N
ILLINOIS					MONTANA					RHODE ISLAND				
Douglas	N	N	N	Y	Mansfield	N	N	N	Y	Pastore	N	N	N	Y
Dirksen	Y	Y	Y	N	Metcalf	N	N	N	Y	Pell	N	N	N	Y

Democrats in this type; Republicans in Italics

CQ House Votes 33 through 36.

(Corresponding to Congressional Record Roll-Call Vote Nos. 65, 67, 70, 71.)

House Rejects Recommittal Motion on Railway Mail Rate Bill, Votes 1962 Funds for Agriculture, State, Justice, Judiciary

33. HR 1986. Repeal a provision of the Railway Mail Pay Act of 1916 that was intended to prevent railroads from charging higher rates for carrying non-first-class mail than for carrying express matter. Gross (R Iowa) motion to recommit the bill and add an amendment requiring the ICC to publish the difference in rates paid to the railroads by the Post Office Department and the REA Express for carrying commodities of similar weight. Rejected 16-346 (D 7-204; R 9-142), May 25, 1961. The President did not take a position on the motion. (See story, Weekly Report p. 910)

34. HR 7371. Appropriate \$751,300,050 for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary and related agencies in fiscal 1962. Passed 256-71 (D 155-34; R 101-37), June 1, 1961.

The President did not take a position on the bill. (See story p. 943)

35. HR 7444. Agriculture Department appropriations for fiscal 1962. Reuss (D Wis.) amendment to reduce the \$250 million authorization for Agricultural Conservation Program payments in calendar 1962 to \$150 million, as proposed by the President. Rejected 184-196 (D 80-148; R 104-48), June 6, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position. (See story p. 941)

36. HR 7444. Passage of the bill appropriating \$5,948,466,000 for the Agriculture Department and Commodity Credit Corporation. Passed 319-65 (D 219-11; R 100-54), June 6, 1961. The President did not take a position on the bill.

TOTAL					DEMOCRATIC					REPUBLICAN				
Vote No.	33	34	35	36	Vote No.	33	34	35	36	Vote No.	33	34	35	36
Yea	16	256	184	319	Yea	7	155	80	219	Yea	9	101	104	100
Nay	346	71	196	65	Nay	204	34	148	11	Nay	142	37	48	54

33 34 35 36					33 34 35 36					33 34 35 36					- KEY -				
ALABAMA					ALASKA					ARIZONA					Y Record Vote For (yes). ✓ Paired For. † Announced For, CQ Poll For. N Record Vote Against (nay). X Paired Against. — Announced Against, CQ Poll Against. ? Absent, General Pair, "Present," Did not announce or answer Poll.				
3 Andrews	N	N	N	Y	AL Rivers	N	Y	N	Y	2 Udall M.	N	Y	Y	Y					
1 Boykin	N	?	N	Y	1 Rhodes	N	Y	Y	Y	ARKANSAS					33 34 35 36				
2 Elliott	N	Y	N	Y	5 Alford	?	N	N	Y	1 Gathings	N	?	N	Y					
2 Grant	N	?	?	?	4 Harris	N	?	N	Y	2 Mills	N	N	N	Y	IOWA				
9 Huddleston	?	?	N	Y	6 Norrell C.	N	N	N	Y	3 Trimble	?	Y	N	Y	6 Coad	N	Y	N	Y
8 Jones	N	Y	X	?	3 Trumble	?	Y	N	Y	CALIFORNIA					5 Smith	N	Y	N	Y
5 Rains	N	Y	X	?	7 Cohelan	N	Y	Y	Y	14 Hagen	N	Y	N	Y	2 Bromwell	?	Y	Y	Y
4 Roberts	?	?	X	?	10 Gubser	N	Y	N	Y	11 McFall	N	Y	N	Y	3 Gross	Y	N	Y	Y
6 Selden	N	N	N	Y	8 Miller C.	N	Y	N	Y	8 Miller G.P.	Y	Y	✓	?	8 Hoeven	N	N	X	Y
ALASKA					3 Moss	?	Y	N	Y	29 Sound	N	Y	?	Y	7 Jensen	N	Y	N	Y
AL Rivers	N	Y	N	Y	5 Shelley	N	?	Y	Y	5 Sheppard	?	Y	✓	?	4 Kyl	Y	N	N	Y
ARIZONA					12 Sisk	N	Y	N	Y	27 Sheppard	?	Y	✓	?	1 Schwengel	N	Y	N	Y
2 Udall M.	N	Y	Y	Y	6 Baldwin	N	Y	N	Y	12 Sisk	N	Y	N	Y	KANSAS				
1 Rhodes	N	Y	Y	Y	10 Gubser	N	Y	N	Y	6 Balduin	N	?	N	Y	5 Breeding	N	Y	N	Y
ARKANSAS					4 Mailliard	N	Y	N	Y	11 McFall	N	Y	N	Y	1 Avery	N	Y	N	Y
5 Alford	?	N	N	Y	13 Teague	N	Y	N	Y	1 Miller C.	N	Y	N	Y	6 Dole	N	N	N	Y
1 Gathings	N	?	N	Y	28 Utt	N	?	?	?	8 Miller G.P.	Y	Y	✓	?	2 Ellsworth	N	Y	Y	Y
4 Harris	N	?	N	Y	30 Wilson	N	Y	N	Y	3 Moss	?	Y	N	Y	3 McVey	N	?	Y	Y
2 Mills	N	N	N	Y	9 Younger	N	N	Y	N	29 Sound	N	Y	?	Y	4 Shriver	N	Y	N	Y
6 Norrell C.	N	N	N	Y	Los Angeles Co.	N	Y	N	Y	5 Shelley	N	?	Y	Y	KENTUCKY				
3 Trimble	?	Y	N	Y	22 Corman	N	Y	N	Y	27 Sheppard	?	Y	✓	?	3 Burke	N	Y	?	Y
CALIFORNIA					23 Doyle	N	Y	N	Y	12 Sisk	N	Y	N	Y	4 Chelf	N	Y	N	Y
7 Cohelan	N	Y	Y	Y						6 Balduin	N	?	N	Y	2 Natcher	N	Y	N	Y
14 Hagen	N	Y	N	Y						10 Gubser	N	Y	N	Y	7 Perkins	N	Y	N	Y
2 Johnson	N	Y	N	Y						4 Mailliard	N	Y	N	Y	5 Spence	N	Y	N	Y
11 McFall	N	Y	N	Y						13 Teague	N	Y	N	Y	1 Strublefield	N	Y	N	Y
1 Miller C.	N	Y	N	Y						28 Utt	N	?	?	?	6 Watts	N	?	N	Y
8 Miller G.P.	Y	Y	✓	?						30 Wilson	N	Y	N	Y	8 Siler	N	N	Y	Y
3 Moss	?	Y	N	Y						9 Younger	N	N	Y	N	LOUISIANA				
29 Sound	N	Y	?	Y						Los Angeles Co.	N	Y	N	Y	2 Boggs	?	Y	X	?
5 Shelley	N	?	Y	Y						22 Corman	N	Y	N	Y	4 Brooks	N	?	N	Y
27 Sheppard	?	Y	✓	?						23 Doyle	N	Y	N	Y	1 Hebert	N	Y	N	?
12 Sisk	N	Y	N	Y											8 McSween	?	?	N	Y
6 Baldwin	N	Y	N	Y															
10 Gubser	N	?	N	Y															
4 Mailliard	N	Y	N	Y															
13 Teague	N	Y	N	Y															
28 Utt	N	?	?	?															
30 Wilson	N	Y	N	Y															
9 Younger	N	N	Y	N															
Los Angeles Co.	N	Y	N	Y															
22 Corman	N	Y	N	Y															
23 Doyle	N	Y	N	Y															

Democrats in this type; Republicans in italics

CQ House Votes 33 through 36.

(Corresponding to Congressional Record Roll-Call Vote Nos. 65, 67, 70, 71.)

33	34	35	36		33	34	35	36		33	34	35	36		33	34	35	36	
6 Morrison	N	?	N	Y	NEBRASKA					5 Scott	N	?	N	Y	6 McMillan	N	N	N	Y
5 Passman	Y	?	?	Y	3 Beermann	N	?	✓	?	12 Taylor	N	Y	N	Y	2 Riley	?	Y	N	Y
7 Thompson	N	?	N	Y	2 Cunningham	N	N	Y	Y	11 Whitener	N	Y	N	Y	1 Rivers	N	?	N	Y
3 Willis	N	Y	X	?	4 Martin	N	?	Y	Y	10 Jonas	N	Y	Y	Y	SOUTH DAKOTA				
MAINE					1 Weaver	N	Y	N	Y	NORTH DAKOTA					2 Berry	N	N	N	Y
1 Garland	N	?	Y	Y	NEVADA					AL Nygaard	N	Y	N	Y	1 Reifel	N	Y	N	Y
3 McIntire	N	Y	N	Y	AL Boring	?	Y	Y	N	AL Short	?	N	Y	Y	TENNESSEE				
2 Tupper	N	?	N	Y	NEW HAMPSHIRE					OHIO					6 Bass	N	Y	N	Y
MARYLAND					2 Bass	N	Y	N	Y	9 Ashley	N	?	Y	Y	9 Davis	?	Y	X	?
2 Brewster	N	Y	Y	N	1 Merrow	N	?	N	Y	11 Cook	N	Y	N	Y	8 Everett	N	N	N	Y
4 Fallon	N	Y	✓	Y	NEW JERSEY					20 Feighan	N	Y	Y	Y	4 Evins	N	?	X	?
7 Friedel	N	Y	Y	Y	11 Addonizio	N	?	Y	Y	18 Hays	N	Y	N	Y	3 Frazier	N	N	N	Y
3 Garmatz	N	Y	Y	Y	14 Daniels	N	Y	✓	?	19 Kirwan	N	Y	Y	?	5 Loner	N	?	X	?
1 Johnson	N	Y	N	Y	13 Gallagher	N	Y	Y	Y	10 Moeller	N	?	?	Y	7 Murray	N	N	N	Y
5 Lankford	N	Y	N	Y	8 Joelson	Y	Y	Y	N	21 Vanik	N	?	?	Y	2 Baker	N	✓	N	Y
6 Mathias	N	Y	N	Y	10 Rodino	?	Y	Y	Y	17 Ashtbrook	?	N	Y	N	1 Reace L.	N	Y	N	Y
MASSACHUSETTS					4 Thompson	?	Y	Y	Y	14 Ayres	N	?	?	Y	TEXAS				
2 Boland	N	Y	Y	Y	3 Auchincloss	?	Y	Y	N	8 Betts	N	Y	Y	Y	3 Beckworth	?	Y	Y	Y
13 Burke	N	Y	Y	Y	1 Cabill	N	Y	Y	N	22 Bolton	N	Y	Y	Y	2 Brooks	N	Y	N	Y
4 Donahue	N	?	Y	Y	6 Dwyer	N	?	Y	N	16 Bow	Y	Y	N	Y	17 Burleson	N	N	N	Y
7 Lane	N	Y	N	Y	5 Frelinghuysen	N	Y	Y	Y	7 Brown	N	Y	N	Y	22 Casey	N	N	N	Y
8 Macdonald	N	Y	Y	Y	2 Glenn	N	Y	Y	Y	2 Clancy	N	Y	Y	Y	7 Dowdy	N	N	N	Y
12 McCormack	N	Y	X	Y	9 Osners	N	Y	Y	N	12 Devine	?	N	Y	N	21 Fisher	N	N	N	Y
11 O'Neill	N	?	✓	?	12 Wallhauser	N	Y	Y	N	6 Harsha	N	?	?	Y	13 Ikard	?	Y	Y	Y
3 Philbin	N	?	Y	Y	7 Widnall	N	Y	Y	N	5 Latta	N	?	?	Y	20 Kilday	N	Y	N	Y
6 Bates	N	Y	Y	N	NEW MEXICO					4 McCulloch	N	Y	Y	Y	15 Kilgore	N	Y	N	Y
1 Conte	N	Y	?	?	AL Montoya	N	Y	N	Y	23 Minshall	N	N	Y	N	19 Mahon	N	Y	N	Y
10 Curtis	N	Y	Y	N	AL Morris	N	Y	N	Y	15 Moorehead	N	Y	Y	Y	1 Patman	N	Y	N	Y
9 Keith	N	Y	Y	Y	NEW YORK					13 Mosher	N	Y	Y	N	11 Poage	N	Y	N	Y
14 Martin	N	Y	Y	N	41 Dulski	N	?	Y	N	3 Schenck	N	N	Y	N	4 Rayburn	N	Y	N	Y
5 Morse	N	Y	Y	Y	30 O'Brien	?	Y	✓	?	1 Scherer	?	N	Y	N	18 Rogers	N	N	N	Y
MICHIGAN					1 Pike	N	Y	Y	N	OKLAHOMA					16 Rutherford	N	Y	N	Y
7 O'Hara	N	Y	N	Y	32 Stratton	N	Y	Y	Y	3 Albert	?	Y	X	Y	6 Teague	N	Y	N	Y
12 Bennett	N	N	N	?	27 Barry	N	Y	Y	Y	2 Edmondson	N	Y	N	Y	8 Thomas	N	Y	N	Y
18 Broomfield	N	?	Y	N	3 Becker	N	Y	Y	Y	5 Jorman	N	Y	N	Y	9 Thompson	N	Y	N	Y
10 Cederberg	N	Y	Y	Y	2 Derounian	?	Y	Y	N	4 Steed	N	?	N	Y	10 Thornberry	N	Y	N	?
6 Chamberlain	N	Y	Y	Y	26 Dooley	N	?	Y	Y	6 Wickersham	N	Y	N	Y	12 Wright	N	Y	N	Y
5 Ford	N	Y	Y	N	43 Goodell	N	Y	Y	N	1 Belcher	?	?	N	Y	14 Young	?	?	N	Y
9 Griffin	N	Y	Y	Y	33 Kilburn	?	?	✓	?	OREGON					5 Alger	N	?	?	N
8 Harvey	N	Y	Y	Y	31 King	N	N	Y	Y	3 Green	N	?	Y	N	UTAH				
4 Hoffman	?	N	Y	N	40 Miller	?	?	?	?	2 Ullman	N	Y	N	Y	2 King	N	Y	N	Y
3 Jobansen	Y	N	Y	N	39 Ostertag	?	Y	Y	Y	4 Durno	N	Y	Y	Y	1 Peterson	N	Y	N	Y
11 Knox	?	?	?	?	42 Pillion	N	N	Y	N	1 Norblad	N	Y	N	Y	VERMONT				
2 Meader	N	Y	Y	Y	34 Pirnie	N	Y	X	?	PENNSYLVANIA					AL Stafford	N	Y	N	Y
Detroit - Wayne County					35 Rieblman	?	Y	Y	Y	25 Clark	N	Y	Y	Y	VIRGINIA				
13 Diggs	?	?	Y	Y	37 Robison	N	Y	Y	Y	21 Dent	?	Y	Y	Y	4 Abbitt	N	N	N	Y
15 Dingell	Y	Y	Y	N	28 St. George	N	N	Y	N	11 Flood	N	Y	N	?	1 Downing	N	Y	?	?
17 Griffiths	N	Y	Y	Y	36 Taber	N	N	Y	N	30 Holland	N	Y	Y	?	3 Gary	N	?	Y	Y
16 Lesinski	N	?	Y	Y	38 Weis	N	?	Y	Y	28 Moorhead	N	Y	Y	Y	2 Hardy	N	Y	?	?
1 Machrowicz	N	Y	Y	Y	29 Wharton	N	?	N	N	26 Morgan	N	Y	X	Y	7 Harrison	?	Y	X	?
14 Rabaut	N	Y	N	Y	New York City					14 Rhodes	N	Y	Y	Y	9 Jennings	N	Y	N	Y
MINNESOTA					5 Addabbo	N	?	Y	Y	15 Walter	N	Y	✓	?	8 Smith	?	?	?	Y
8 Blatnik	N	Y	N	Y	8 Anuso	N	?	Y	Y	29 Corbett	Y	Y	Y	?	5 Tuck	N	?	?	Y
4 Karth	N	?	N	Y	24 Buckley	?	?	N	Y	8 Curtin	?	Y	Y	Y	10 Broyhill	N	Y	Y	Y
6 Marshall	?	?	N	Y	12 Carey	N	Y	Y	Y	9 Dague	N	Y	Y	Y	6 Poff	N	Y	N	Y
7 Andersen	N	Y	N	Y	11 Celler	N	Y	N	Y	12 Fenton	N	Y	Y	Y	WASHINGTON				
5 Judd	N	Y	Y	Y	7 Delaney	N	?	Y	Y	27 Fulton	N	Y	Y	Y	3 Hansen	N	?	N	Y
9 Langen	N	N	N	Y	19 Farbstein	N	Y	Y	Y	23 Gavin	N	Y	Y	Y	7 Magnuson	N	Y	N	Y
3 MacGregor	N	Y	Y	Y	23 Gilbert	N	Y	Y	Y	19 Goodling	N	Y	Y	Y	5 Horan	Y	?	N	Y
2 Nelsen	N	?	N	Y	22 Healey	N	Y	Y	Y	24 Kearns	N	Y	Y	Y	4 May	?	?	?	Y
1 Quie	N	Y	N	Y	6 Holtzman	N	Y	Y	Y	7 Milliken	N	?	Y	Y	1 Pelly	N	Y	Y	N
MISSISSIPPI					10 Kelly	N	?	Y	Y	16 Kunkel	N	Y	Y	Y	6 Tollefson	N	Y	Y	N
1 Abernethy	N	X	N	Y	9 Keogh	?	Y	Y	Y	22 Saylor	N	Y	N	N	2 Westland	?	?	?	?
6 Colmer	?	?	N	Y	13 Multer	N	Y	N	Y	17 Schneebeli	N	Y	Y	Y	WEST VIRGINIA				
3 Smith	?	N	N	Y	16 Powell	N	?	N	Y	13 Schweiker	N	Y	Y	N	3 Bailey	Y	Y	N	Y
2 Whitten	?	N	N	Y	14 Rooney	N	Y	N	Y	10 Scranton	N	Y	Y	Y	4 Hechler	N	Y	Y	Y
4 Williams	N	N	N	Y	20 Ryan	N	Y	Y	Y	20 Van Zandt	N	Y	Y	Y	5 Kee	N	?	N	Y
5 Winstead	N	N	N	Y	18 Santangelo	N	Y	Y	Y	18 Whalley	N	Y	Y	Y	6 Slack	N	Y	N	Y
MISSOURI					21 Zelenko	?	?	Y	Y	Philadelphia City					2 Staggers	N	?	N	Y
5 Bolling	?	?	Y	Y	25 Fino	?	?	✓	?	1 Barrett	N	?	Y	Y	1 Moore	N	Y	N	Y
9 Cannon	N	Y	N	Y	4 Halpern	N	Y	Y	Y	3 Byrne	N	Y	Y	Y	WISCONSIN				
6 Hull	N	?	N	Y	17 Lindsay	N	Y	Y	Y	2 Granahan	N	Y	Y	Y	9 Johnson	?	Y	N	Y
8 Ichord	N	Y	N	Y	15 Ray	Y	N	Y	N	5 Green	N	?	✓	?	2 Kastenmeier	N	Y	N	Y
10 Jones	?	Y	Y	Y	NORTH CAROLINA					4 Nix	N	Y	Y	Y	5 Reuss	N	Y	Y	Y
1 Karsten	N	Y	Y	Y	9 Alexander	?	?	N	Y	6 Toll	N	Y	Y	Y	4 Zablocki	N	Y	N	Y
11 Maulder	?	Y	Y	Y	1 Bonner	?	?	N	Y	RHODE ISLAND					8 Byrnes	N	Y	?	?
4 Randall	N	?	N	Y	4 Cooley	?	?	N	?	2 Fogarty	?	?	✓	?	7 Laird	N	Y	N	Y
3 Sullivan	N	Y	Y	Y	2 Fountain	N	?	N	Y	1 St. Germain	N	Y	✓	?	10 O'Konski	?	?	?	?
2 Curtis	N	?	Y	N	3 Henderson	N	Y	Y	Y	SOUTH CAROLINA					1 Schadeberg	N	N	N	Y
7 Hall	Y	N	N	Y	8 Kitchin	N	?	N	Y	4 Ashmore	N	N	N	Y	3 Thomson	N	Y	N	Y
MONTANA					6 Kornegay	N	?	N	Y	3 Dorn	N	N	N	Y	6 Van Pelt	N	Y	N	Y
1 Olsen	N	Y	N	Y	7 Lennon	N	?	N	Y	5 Hemphill	?	N	N	Y	WYOMING				
2 Battin	N	Y	N	Y											AL Harrison	N	Y	N	Y

Democrats in this type; Republicans in italics

(Corresponding to Congressional Record Roll-Call Vote Nos. 75, 76.)

37. HR 7446. Tax Rate Extension Act of 1961. Alger (R Texas) motion to recommit the bill to the Ways and Means Committee with instructions to report it back to the House with an amendment repealing the 10 percent tax on railroad, air, water and bus travel. Rejected 189-196 (D 43-189; R 146-7), June 8, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. (See story p. 937)

38. HR 7446. Passage of the bill extending for one year the current corporation tax rate, certain excise taxes, and the 10 percent taxes on local telephone service and passenger transportation. Passed 295-88 (D 203-27; R 92-61), June 8, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

TOTAL						DEMOCRATIC						REPUBLICAN					
Vote No.		37	38			Vote No.		37	38			Vote No.		37	38		
Yes		189	295			Yes		43	203			Yes		146	92		
No		196	88			No		189	27			No		7	61		

37 38	37 38	37 38	- KEY -
ALABAMA 3 Andrews Y N 1 Boykin Y Y 7 Elliott N Y 2 Grant ? ? 9 Huddleston Y N 8 Jones N Y 5 Rains N Y 4 Roberts ? ? 6 Selden N Y ALASKA AL Rivers N Y ARIZONA 2 Udall M. N Y 1 Rhodes Y N ARKANSAS 5 Alfard Y N 1 Gathings N Y 4 Harris N Y 2 Mills N Y 6 Norrell C. N Y 3 Trimble N Y CALIFORNIA 7 Cohelan N Y 14 Hagen Y Y 2 Johnson N ? 11 McFall Y Y 1 Miller C. Y N 8 Miller G.P. X √ 3 Moss N Y 29 Sound N Y 5 Shelley N Y 27 Sheppard X ? 12 Sisk N Y 6 Baldwin N Y 10 Gubser Y N 4 Mailliard Y Y 13 Teague Y Y 28 Utt √ X 30 Wilson √ X 9 Younger Y Y Los Angeles Co. 22 Corman N Y 23 Doyle N Y	19 Holifield N Y 17 King N Y 26 Roosevelt X √ 16 Bell X 21 Hiestand Y N 18 Hosmer √ ? 24 Lipscomb Y N 15 McDonough Y N 25 Rousselot Y N 20 Smith Y N COLORADO 4 Aspinall N Y 1 Rogers Y N 3 Chenoweth Y Y 2 Dominick Y N CONNECTICUT 1 Daddario N Y 3 Giaimo N Y AL Kowalski N Y 5 Monagan N Y 2 Seely-Brown Y Y 4 Sibal Y Y DELAWARE AL McDowell N Y FLORIDA 2 Bennett N Y 4 Foscell N Y 7 Haley Y N 5 Herlong N Y 8 Matthews N Y 6 Rogers Y Y 3 Sikes N Y 1 Cramer Y Y GEORGIA 8 Blitch ? ? 5 Davis J.C. √ X 7 Davis J.W. N Y 4 Flynt Y N 3 Forrester N Y 1 Hagan N Y 9 Landrum N ? 2 Pilcher X ? 10 Stephens N Y 6 Vinson N Y	HAWAII AL Inouye Y Y IDAHO 2 Harding N Y 1 Pfost N Y ILLINOIS 25 Gray N Y 21 Mack Y Y 24 Price Y Y 23 Shipley N Y 16 Anderson Y Y 17 Arends Y Y 19 Chipperfield Y Y 20 Findley Y N 14 Hoffman Y N 15 Mason √ X 18 Michel Y N 22 Springer Y Y Chicago Cook County 1 Dawson N Y 12 Finnegan N Y 5 Kluczynski N Y 7 Libonati N Y 3 Murphy N Y 6 O'Brien N Y 2 O'Hara N Y 11 Pucinski N Y 8 Rostenkowski N Y 9 Yates N Y 13 Church Y N 10 Collier Y N 4 Derwinski Y N INDIANA 3 Brademas N Y 8 Denton N Y 1 Madden N Y 4 Adair Y Y 7 Bray Y N 11 Bruce Y Y 5 Vacancy Y Y 2 Halleck N Y 10 Harvey N Y 6 Roudsbush √ N 9 Wilson Y N	Y Record Vote For (yea). √ Paired For. 2 Announced For, CQ Poll For. N Record Vote Against (nay). X Paired Against. - Announced Against, CQ Poll Against. ? Absent, General Pair, "Present," Did not announce or answer Poll. 37 38 IOWA 6 Coad N Y 5 Smith N Y 2 Bromwell Y N 3 Gross Y N 8 Hoeven Y Y 7 Jensen Y N 4 Kyl Y Y 1 Schwengel Y Y KANSAS 5 Breeding Y Y 1 Avery Y Y 6 Dale Y N 2 Ellsworth Y Y 3 McVey Y N 4 Sbriver Y Y KENTUCKY 3 Burke N Y 4 Chelf N Y 2 Natcher N Y 7 Perkins N Y 5 Spence N Y 1 Stubblefield N Y 6 Watts Y N 8 Siler Y N LOUISIANA 2 Boggs N Y 4 Brooks Y N 1 Hebert N Y 8 McSween Y Y

Democrats in this type; *Republicans in Italics*

CQ House Votes 37 through 38.

(Corresponding to Congressional Record Roll-Call Vote Nos. 75, 76.)

37 38	37 38	37 38	37 38
6 Morrison N Y	NEBRASKA	5 Scott Y N	6 McMillan Y N
5 Passman N N	3 Beermann ? X	12 Taylor N Y	2 Riley Y Y
7 Thompson X ?	2 Cunningham Y N	11 Whitener Y N	1 Rivers N Y
3 Willis ? ?	4 Martin Y N	10 Jonas Y N	SOUTH DAKOTA
MAINE	1 Weaver Y N	NORTH DAKOTA	2 Berry Y Y
1 Garland Y Y	NEVADA	AL Nygaard Y Y	1 Reifel Y Y
3 McIntire Y Y	AL Baring Y N	AL Short Y N	TENNESSEE
2 Tupper Y N	NEW HAMPSHIRE	OHIO	6 Bass ? ?
MARYLAND	2 Bass N Y	9 Ashley N Y	9 Davis X ?
2 Brewster Y Y	1 Merrow Y N	11 Cook N Y	8 Everett N Y
4 Fallon X ✓	NEW JERSEY	20 Feighan N Y	4 Ewins N Y
7 Friedel N Y	11 Addonizio N Y	18 Hays Y Y	3 Frazier N Y
3 Garmatz N Y	14 Daniels N Y	19 Kirwan N Y	5 Loser Y N
1 Johnson N Y	13 Gallagher X ?	10 Moeller N Y	7 Murray N Y
5 Lankford N Y	8 Joelson N Y	21 Vanik N Y	2 Baker Y Y
6 Matbias Y Y	10 Rodino N Y	17 Ashbrook Y N	1 Reece L. Y Y
MASSACHUSETTS	4 Thompson N Y	14 Ayres Y ?	TEXAS
2 Boland N Y	3 Auchincloss Y Y	8 Betts Y Y	3 Beckworth Y Y
13 Burke N Y	1 Cabill Y N	22 Bolton Y Y	2 Brooks N Y
4 Donohue N Y	6 Dwyer Y Y	16 Bow Y Y	17 Burlison N Y
7 Lane N Y	5 Frelinghuysen Y Y	7 Brown Y Y	22 Casey N N
8 Macdonald N Y	2 Glenn ✓ X	2 Clancy Y Y	7 Dowdy Y Y
12 McCormack N Y	9 Osmer Y N	12 Devine Y N	21 Fisher N Y
11 O'Neill X ✓	12 Wallbauser Y Y	6 Harsba Y Y	13 Ikard N Y
3 Philbin N N	7 Widnall Y Y	5 Latta Y Y	20 Kilday N Y
6 Bates Y Y	NEW MEXICO	4 McCulloch Y Y	15 Kilgore N N
1 Conte Y Y	AL Montoya N Y	23 Minsball Y Y	19 Mahon N Y
10 Curtis N Y	AL Morris N Y	15 Moorehead Y ?	1 Patman N Y
9 Keith Y Y	NEW YORK	13 Mosber ? ?	11 Poage N N
14 Martin Y N	41 Dulski N N	3 Schenck Y Y	4 Rayburn N N
5 Morse Y Y	30 O'Brien ? ?	1 Scherer Y Y	18 Rogers N N
MICHIGAN	1 Pike Y Y	OKLAHOMA	16 Rutherford N N
7 O'Hara N Y	32 Stratton N Y	3 Albert N Y	6 Teague N Y
12 Bennett Y Y	27 Barry Y Y	2 Edmondson N Y	8 Thomas N Y
18 Broomfield ✓ X	3 Becker Y N	5 Jarman N Y	9 Thompson N Y
10 Cederberg ✓ X	2 Derounian Y Y	4 Steed N Y	10 Thornberry N Y
6 Chamberlain Y N	26 Dooley Y Y	6 Wickersham N Y	12 Wright N Y
5 Ford Y Y	43 Goodell Y N	1 Belcher Y Y	14 Young X ?
9 Griffin N Y	33 Kilburn ✓ ?	OREGON	5 Alger Y N
8 Harvey Y Y	31 King Y N	3 Green N Y	UTAH
4 Hoffman Y N	40 Miller ✓ X	2 Ullman Y Y	2 King N Y
3 Jobansen Y N	39 Ostertag Y Y	4 Durno Y Y	1 Peterson N Y
11 Knox ✓ ?	42 Pillion Y N	1 Norblad Y Y	VERMONT
2 Meader Y Y	34 Pirmie Y Y	PENNSYLVANIA	AL Stafford Y Y
Detroit - Wayne County	35 Rieblman Y Y	25 Clark N Y	VIRGINIA
13 Diggs N Y	37 Robison Y N	21 Dent Y Y	4 Abbitt Y Y
15 Dingell N Y	28 St. George ✓ ?	11 Flood N Y	1 Downing N Y
17 Griffiths N Y	36 Taber Y ?	30 Holland N Y	3 Gary N Y
16 Lesinski N Y	38 Weis ✓ ?	28 Moorhead N Y	2 Hardy N Y
1 Machrowicz N Y	29 Wharton Y N	26 Morgan N Y	7 Harrison N Y
14 Rabaut N Y	New York City	14 Rhodes N Y	9 Jennings N Y
MINNESOTA	5 Addabbo N Y	15 Walter X ✓	8 Smith N Y
8 Blatnik X ?	8 Anuso X ✓	29 Corbett Y Y	5 Tuck Y Y
4 Karth N ?	24 Buckley X ✓	8 Curtin Y N	10 Broyles ? ?
6 Marshall N Y	12 Carey N Y	9 Dague Y N	6 Poff Y Y
7 Andersen ? ?	11 Celler N Y	12 Fenton Y Y	WASHINGTON
5 Judd Y Y	7 Delaney Y Y	27 Fulton Y Y	3 Hansen N Y
9 Langen Y Y	19 Farbstein Y Y	23 Gavin Y N	7 Magnuson N Y
3 MacGregor Y Y	23 Gilbert N Y	19 Goodling Y N	5 Haran Y Y
2 Nelsen Y Y	22 Healey N Y	24 Kearns Y N	4 May Y N
1 Quie Y Y	6 Holtzman N Y	7 Milliken Y N	1 Pelly Y N
MISSISSIPPI	10 Kelly N Y	16 Kunkel Y Y	6 Tollefson Y N
1 Abernethy Y N	9 Keogh X ✓	22 Saylor Y Y	2 Westland Y Y
6 Colmer ? ?	13 Multer N Y	17 Schneebeli Y Y	WEST VIRGINIA
3 Smith ? ?	16 Powell ? ?	13 Schweiker Y N	3 Bailey N Y
2 Whitten Y N	14 Rooney N Y	10 Scranton Y Y	4 Hechler Y Y
4 Williams Y N	20 Ryan N Y	20 Van Zandt Y Y	5 Kee N Y
5 Winstead Y N	18 Santangelo N Y	18 Whalley Y Y	6 Slack N Y
MISSOURI	21 Zelenko X ✓	Philadelphia City	2 Staggers Y Y
5 Bolling ? ?	25 Fino ✓ X	1 Barrett N Y	1 Moore Y N
9 Cannon Y Y	4 Halpern Y Y	3 Byrne N Y	WISCONSIN
6 Hull N Y	17 Lindsay N Y	2 Gronahan X ✓	9 Johnson N Y
8 Ichord N Y	15 Ray Y N	5 Green N Y	2 Kastenmeier N Y
10 Jones N Y	NORTH CAROLINA	4 Nix N Y	5 Reuss N Y
1 Karsten N Y	9 Alexander N Y	6 Toll N Y	4 Zablocki N Y
11 Moulder N Y	1 Bonner X ?	RHODE ISLAND	8 Byrnes Y Y
4 Randall N Y	4 Cooley N Y	2 Fogarty ✓ ✓	7 Latrd Y Y
3 Sullivan N Y	2 Fountain N Y	1 St. Germain N Y	10 O'Konski ? ?
2 Curtis ✓ ?	3 Henderson Y Y	SOUTH CAROLINA	1 Schadeberg Y N
7 Hall Y N	8 Kitchin N Y	4 Ashmore Y Y	3 Thomson Y Y
MONTANA	6 Kornegay Y Y	3 Dorn Y N	6 Van Pelt ✓ X
1 Olsen N Y	7 Lennon N Y	5 Hemphill Y N	WYOMING
2 Battin Y N			AL Harrison Y N

Democrats in this type; Republicans in Italics



The Week In Congress

Housing Bill President Kennedy scored a major victory on his housing program after a bitter fight that kept the Senate in session until 1:35 a.m. Friday. The bill was readied for final passage after Administration lieutenants battled for hours to successfully reverse an amendment, introduced by Albert Gore (D Tenn.), which cut from the bill the President's no-downpayment, 40-year mortgage program for moderate income families. A substitute version, requiring up to \$555 in downpayment, was put back in the bill by a 47-42 vote. (Page 937)

Other Actions

The House passed and sent to the Senate appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice and Agriculture and miscellaneous agencies. The Senate passed and sent to conference Interior Department appropriations. The House voted to extend excise and corporate income taxes and passed increases in veterans' compensation and deferral of income tax payments on self-employed retirement funds. The Senate passed and sent to the House a PL 480 extension and adopted a resolution in favor of a white fleet to aid disaster-struck nations. (Page 937-943)

Kennedy Trip

President Kennedy, home from his European trip, said the U.S. would continue to strive for an effective Laotian cease-fire and would not resume nuclear tests. His frank report on his meetings with President de Gaulle, Premier Khrushchev and Prime Minister Macmillan received bipartisan support on Capitol Hill. (Page 944)

Political Notes

A CQ redistricting report describes the redrawing of Congressional districts in Florida to allow for a four seat gain as a result of a 78.7 percent population increase in the state since 1950.... Reps. Merwin Coad (D Iowa) and Paul J. Kilday (D Texas) announced their forthcoming retirement from the House.... Former Vice President Nixon attacked the Administration's domestic and foreign policies in two California speeches. (Page 954-56)

Roll-Call Votes

SENATE: Interior appropriation, p. 968; housing, p. 968, 969.

HOUSE: Railway mail rates, State, Justice, Judiciary, Agriculture appropriations, p. 970; tax rate extension, p. 972.

Summer Recess Poll

Why can't Congressmen have a summer vacation just like everybody else? Congressional Quarterly polled all Senators and Representatives on how they feel about proposals for a summer recess -- called "nonsense" by Speaker Rayburn and dearly sought by the younger Members who have school children. Results of the poll: the majority of Members responding say they want things to remain the way they are. (Page 947)

Around the Capitol

Administration spokesmen asked unions and business to help prevent inflation through "self-discipline" in seeking wage and price increases and an Organization for European Economic Cooperation report cited union wage demands and price fixing as causes for U.S. rising prices.... The Supreme Court upheld two provisions restricting the Communist Party.... "Freedom rides" continued but the desegregation battle centered in the courts.... President Kennedy asked Congress for experimental employment training programs for unemployed youth.... The President suffered a minor back injury on his Canada trip. (Pages 945, 946, 967)

In the Committees

The House Education and Labor Committee reported the Administration school aid bill.... A House committee reported a resolution disapproving the President's reorganization plan for the Federal Communications Commission.... Hearings were held on the Administration's foreign aid program and bills to create a federal boxing commissioner, set up an Urban Affairs Department, compel antitrust information, tighten regulations on pension plan disclosures, revise highway program financing, establish a farm program and raise postal rates. (Pages 948-53)

